Gal 10. L.e

LECTURES

IN

DIVINITY,

DELIVERED IN THE

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,

BY

JOHN HEY, D.D.

AS NORRISIAN PROFESSOR.

VOLUME THE FOURTH.

CAMBRIDGE,

PRINTED BY JOHN BURGES PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY;

AND SOLD BY J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; LEIGH & SOTHEBY, YORK-STREET, COVENT-GARDEN, RIVINGTONS, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD, PAYNE, MEWS-GATE, SHEPPERSON & REYNOLDS, NO. 137, AND W. H. LUNN, NO 332, OXFORD-STREET, LONDON; AND COOKE, OXFORD.

MDCCXCVIII.

8

MUSEUM
BRITAN
NIC

LECTURES

IN

DIVINITY, &c.

BOOK IV.

CONTINUATION OF ARTICLE XVII.

SECT. XVII.

QUEEN *Mary's* court does not ſeem to have intermeddled much with Predeſtination; they had other matters to engage their attention; their chief view was, to bring the nation back to Popery; as we have given the deciſion of the Council of *Trent*, we need take no more notice of the popiſh part of our countrymen.

The reformed fell into diſputes amongſt themſelves even in priſon, where they were confined as Heretics, expecting, many of them, to be brought to the ſtake; "they wrote againſt each other, and diſperſed their writings abroad in the world[a]."— The doctrine of Predeſtination was even now gaining ſtrength amongſt the generality of plain divines, though

[a] Neal, Vol. 1. 4to. page 69. Oxf. page 67. Heylin.

though it was checked by ſome of the moſt improved minds. Some *forms* were drawn up for the priſoners to ſign, in order to reduce them to amity; but they are not extant: it ſeems probable, that though they did not run into the extreme of Calviniſm, they approached too near it to be encouraged by the principal[b] Reformers. *Bradford* and *Carleſs* are named on this occaſion; both martyrs; as were many others engaged in the diſpute.

XVIII. *Elizabeth* came to the throne in 1558. In the beginning of her reign the more liberal and polite ſort of divines wiſhed to lower the doctrine of Predeſtination, or to avoid it. The leſs liberal and refined puſhed it forward very ſtoutly; nay tyrannically, ſo as to oblige ſome to ſeek for ſhelter and protection. Both theſe things appear, I think, from *Strype's*[c] Annals. Beſides, the *Puritans*, who were Calviniſts, got conſiderable power in the *Houſe of Commons*, and made the Queen ſo *jealous*, that their propoſing to ratify by act of Parliament the *Reformatio Legum*, was reaſon ſufficient[d] with her to ſet it aſide.

Much of the growth of Calviniſm has been aſcribed to the *flight* of the Proteſtant divines from England during the reign of Queen Mary: ſome went to *Geneva*, others to Switzerland, &c.—But[e] *Jewel*

[b] Oxford Pamph. page 67, &c.

[c] Annals 1559, page 116. 118, Vol. 1. and page 294, (in ſome editions I think page 331): my old references to the *firſt* Vol. of Strype's Annals, ſeem all wrong: what Edit. did I uſe? the reference in this Section to the *ſecond* Vol. is right, for Sid. Coll. Library.

[d] Oxford, page 47, from Collier 2. 530.

[e] Some where I have mentioned the bad reception which theſe Refugees met with from the *Lutherans*, on account of their being what was called *Sacramentarians*, that is, denying the corporal preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt: the cruelty of the Lutherans made them take refuge with the Calviniſts, who uſed them

Jewel went to *Italy*; and others to other places[f], where they rather grew weaker than ſtronger in the doctrine about the divine decrees. Much would depend upon the notions they found aſſociated with kindneſs and hoſpitality: but Calviniſm ſeems to me to have been growing in England even before, or during, the reign of Queen Mary.

I gave the Hiſtory of the *Lambeth Articles* under the ſixteenth Article[g]; I have now only to *read* ſuch of them as belong to our preſent ſubject.—The cordial aſſent to them all, of that profeſſed divine Matthew *Hutton*, Archbiſhop of *York*, may amuſe the curious[h]. The remarks of the Biſhops and *Divines*, ſeem to be *ingenious*, and to have drawn the *ſting* of ſome of them very expertly.—I ſuppoſe Archbiſhop *Whitgift* was at the head of theſe[i] remarkers. He is ſaid to have acted "*facilitate*[k] et metu." Though he encouraged ſome eminent preachers againſt Reprobation, he might not think Profeſſor Whitaker a man to be bluntly oppoſed: but his conduct[l] ſeems to prove what has been already obſerved,

1. That men of improved minds, were endeavouring to ſoften the rigours of Predeſtination.

2. That

them kindly: they were indeed of the ſame opinion in regard to the Sacrament.—See Moſheim, Vol. 4. 8vo. page 87, or Cent. 16. 3. 2. 2. 16.

[f] Strype's Annals, 1562, Vol. 1. page 294. (Sid.) or *near* that page; perhaps 293.

[g] Art. XVI. Sect. VIII. [h] Strype's Whitgift, p. 478.

[i] P. S. I cannot find, from Strype's Life of Whitgift, who theſe remarkers were; Strype contradicts this writer of the Lambeth Articles; and repreſents Whitgift, more than that writer does, as favouring Whitaker and Calviniſm. Yet I thought he did not quite prove what he undertook. Whitgift ſeemed to me, even from Strype's account, to be guided much by prudence, and to diſlike Whitaker's zeal.

[k] Hiſt. Art. Lamb. F—15—18, Cambr.

[l] Waterland's Suppl. to Arian Subſcr. page 44, &c.

2. That the leſs refined were very ſtrenuous in heightening the doctrine, and were very hard to reſtrain.

One ſentence of *Neal*[m] may make ſtudents aware of the language of Puritans in whatever books they meet with it. "Though the *Pelagian* doctrine was eſpouſed by very few of the Engliſh Reformers"—"it revived the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's reign under the name of *Arminianiſm*[n], and within the compaſs of a few years ſupplanted the received doctrine of the Reformation."

Before we paſs to another reign, it may not be amiſs to mention the idea of Predeſtination entertained by the *Familiſts*[o]. "There are two, with their members, that are predeſtined, or pre-ordained; the one unto preſervation, and the other unto condemnation, from the beginning: the one is *Chriſt*, the man of God, predeſtined unto preſervation, and with him, all his incorporated members: the other is the man of Sin, *Antichriſt*; predeſtinated unto condemnation; and in him all his incorporated members[p]: as for any other predeſtination than this (come it out of Turkey, or elſewhere) I know not of it."

XIX. In the reign of *James I.* there ſeems to have been an odd mixture of Calviniſm and Arminianiſm. He was bred in the Kirk, and was, at one time, calviniſtic; and he favoured Prince *Maurice* at the Synod of Dort, who favoured the Calviniſts: yet in the conference at Hampton Court, in the beginning of his reign, he diſcouraged them, and never choſe to prefer them in the

[m] Hiſt. of Puritans, Vol. 1. page 70, 4to.

[n] Eliz. died in 1603. Arminius in 1609 (æt. 49)—it was early for the name of *Arminianiſm*.

[o] Art. VII. Sect. III.

[p] Strype's Annals, Vol. 2. page 378. This paſſage is given by Strype from an *Apology* of the Familiſts, but it is not marked with inverted commas.

the Church. He preferred Arminians, yet kept up decency, and reſtrained the Puritans in an artful manner. He gave his preferments to men of abilities and good lives. He forbade the Puritans to *rail* againſt the Papiſts; but then every one was forbidden to rail at the Puritans; this ſounded fair, but was really a great reſtraint. The *five points* were too myſterious and nice for the *ordinary* Clergy to preach upon; reaſonable enough; therefore only *Biſhops* and *Deans* muſt preach upon them; but James made Arminians Biſhops and Deans; and ſo the Puritans were ſilenced on thoſe points which they wanted moſt to propagate.—And ſometimes laws appearing perfectly equal, were ſo executed as to make the Puritans complain. It ſeems as if James, though a Pedant, conſidered things more as a ſtateſman than as a divine; favoured thoſe men whoſe manners were the moſt courtly, and checked, as imperceptibly as he could, thoſe who were more rigid and uncomplying.

xx. In the reign of *Charles I.* Calviniſm grew headſtrong; but ſtill it was not in favour at *Court:* there Arminianiſm flouriſhed: indeed with too great openneſs to be conſiſtent with prudence. One charge againſt Archbiſhop *Laud*, when he was impeached, was Arminianiſm; the oppoſition to that was ſtronger than to anything elſe.

Mr. *Hume*[q] remarks, that perhaps the only thing in which all the Sectaries agreed, was the notion, that the doctrines of Fate and Deſtiny were eſſential to all religion. Dr. Balguy[r] ſpeaks of their overturning the Monarchy, as being only a *ſtep* to overturning the Church.—If we have time, I will read

[q] A.D. 1644. Vol. 5. 4to. p. 371, near the bottom: Chap. viii.—Theſe are not the very words of Hume, but taken from *two* ſentences.

[r] Page 61.

read ſome of Mr. *Rouſe's Speech* in the Houſe of Commons: and a *Proteſt* of the Houſe againſt[s] Arminianiſm, in 1628.

In 1643 the Parliament, by ordinance, appointed an *Aſſembly of Divines* who ſhould reform the Church of England, bring it nearer Calviniſm, and make a coalition with the Church of *Scotland:* we have their *Catechiſms*, and the *Articles* which they reformed; but after debating ten weeks on the firſt fifteen, they ſtopped ſhort, and deſiſted from[t] the taſk.

XXI. The turn which religious opinions took in the reign of *Charles II.* has been mentioned under the eleventh Article.—And the notions of *Antinomians* with regard to Election, ſufficiently, under the ſixteenth. It has been hinted, that *Methodiſts*[u] are divided into Calviniſtic and Arminian: and that the generality of the Engliſh *Clergy*[x] are reputed Arminians. The firſt Earl of *Chatham* ſaid, in Parliament, that we have a Calviniſtic Creed, and an Arminian Clergy[y]; I ſhould be more willing to acknowledge the latter than the former.—Dr. *Jortin* ſays[z], "Our Diſſenters, in the laſt Century, were generally abſolute Predeſtinarians;"—they are now, I take it, moſtly *Socinians*[a]. —The *Quakers* are ſaid to profeſs Arminianiſm: and ſome Preſbyterians, I have been told, continue Calviniſts.

XXII. The

[s] See Neal's Pur. Vol. 1. 4to. page 530, 532, 534. from Ruſhworth.

[t] Neal 1643, Vol. 2. 48. 4to. The articles are in the Appendix.

[u] Art. XVI. Sect. x. [x] Art. XVI. Sect. VIII.

[y] See Belſham's Memoirs of the reign of George III. Vol. 1. page 362. Ed. 1796.

[z] Second Diſſertation, page 112.

[a] I do not perceive that Dr. Prieſtley allows any decree at all. Famil. Illuſtr.

XXII. The moſt formidable Calviniſt of *modern times* I take to be *Jonathan Edwards*. He died in 1758. The modern *Baptiſts* are repreſented by Wall, in his Hiſtory of Infant-baptiſm, (Part 2. Chap. 8. Sect. 6. Subſect. 16), as more earneſt about Predeſtination than any other people in England: As being anxious to know whether any one is a *Freewiller* or a *Freegracer*. They have alſo amongſt them a diviſion of perſons into *General men*, and *Particular* men, from their holding a general or a partial *Redemption*.

XXIII. In *Scotland* John Knox eſtabliſhed Calviniſm; and in 1643 the aſſembly of Divines had in view the *Reformation* of the Church of England, but only the *Preſervation* of the Church of Scotland; which ſhews how calviniſtic it was,—and puritanical in diſcipline. The *Confeſſio* Scotica ſeems to conceive the *true Church*[b] *of Chriſt* to be the *elect*, and others *reprobates*. What are now the notions of the eſtabliſhed preſbyterian Kirk, or of the tolerated epiſcopal Church, I have not been well informed.

XXIV. The *Iriſh*[c] Articles were drawn in 1615 by Archbiſhop *Uſher*, when Provoſt of Dublin College; the *Lambeth Articles* were incorporated into them. But in 1634 Archbiſhop Laud got our XXXIX accepted; Neal ſays, in the *room* of the others; but Waterland ſays the Lambeth Articles were never formally laid aſide. Uſher was then Primate: his *Body of Divinity* is very Calviniſtic, but Waterland ſays, "he renounced his Calvinian principles, as is well atteſted by Three good Hands[d]."

Archbiſhop

[b] Syntagma, page 141. 148. Art. Electio. et de Eccleſiâ.

[c] Neal 1. 475. Waterland Suppl. Ar. Subſcr. p. 51.

[d] In a MS. note in the Library of Magdalen College, Cambridge, are mentioned Bryan Walton, Peter Gunning, and

Archbiſhop *King* has left a very good diſcourſe on Predeſtination.

XXV. Having in the tenth Article reſerved the notion of God's cauſing *evil*, I do the ſame here. —He has been ſuppoſed to cauſe it either by *influence*, or by *decree*; the former belonged to the tenth Article, the latter to this.

Vice is aſcribed to Fate in Homer. Agamemnon excuſes himſelf for robbing Achilles of his prize by ſaying[e], Εγω δ' ȣκ αιτιος ειμι, Αλλα Ζευς και Μοῖρα —*Agathias* mentions it as a common notion, that wars and battles were imputed to the ſtars and fate: ſee Lardner's account of Simplicus in his Heathen teſtimonies[f].

XXVI. With regard to the *Jews*, I know not that I need add anything to what was ſaid under Section 111.—As Jewiſh expreſſions, ariſing from Jewiſh ideas, are the very things which cauſe our difficulties, they will appear of courſe in the ſolution.

XXVII. Some *early Chriſtians* have been ſaid to run into notions of ſin being cauſed by decrees of powers above; but the accounts ſeem ſcarcely to be depended[g] upon. They are mentioned by Heylin at the opening of his Hiſtory of the five Articles. Chap. 1. Sect. 4—6.—But *Colarbaſus* ſeems,

Herbert Thorndike: with reference to Smith's Life of Uſher, and Collier's Eccleſ. Hiſt. Vol. 2. page 868.—And Neal owns the fact, in a degree. Hiſt. Pur. Index.—All the Calviniſts ſtill ſpeak reſpectfully (I am told) of Archbiſhop Uſher.

[e] Iliad, Book 19 l. 86. This expreſſion is quoted by Heylin, p. 507; but a few other expreſſions might be read: Agamemnon ſays, what could he do? a divine power made him offend.

[f] This was mentioned before as an inſtance of aſcribing *events* in general to Fate, Sect. 11. but it ought alſo to appear as an inſtance of aſcribing *evils* to Fate. Natural evil may be diſtinguiſhed from moral, but though war is natural evil, it is uſually cauſed by moral.

[g] Art. XV. Sect. 11. and Art. XVI. Sect. 11.

ſeems, in Aug. de Hær. [illegible]y to have believed in *Æons*. Of the *Priſcillianiſts* Auguſtin ſays, "Aſtruunt etiam *fatalibus* ſtellis homines colligatos," &c.

XXVIII. In *Auguſtin's* time the Monks of *Adrumetum* are ſaid to have held, that God predeſtinated the wicked, not only to puniſhment but to *guilt*. —And all thoſe who came into this notion were called *Predeſtinarians*. But diſputes have ariſen concerning this part[h] of Hiſtory. What I have ſeen of Auguſtin's writings to Valentinus and others of that Monaſtery at Adrumetum, has not given me an[i] idea that they held ſo ſtrange a doctrine.

XXIX. Some have allowed a *foreknowledge of ſin* in God as a motive for reprobation, who would not allow a *foreknowledge*[k] *of merits*, as a motive to Election. Peter *Lombard*[l] ſays, "prædeſtinavit eos quos elegit, reliquos verò reprobavit, id eſt ad mortem eternam præſcivit peccaturos." —Some have made *Reprobation* to conſiſt merely in *not electing*.—The Rhemiſts on Rom. ix 14. ſpeak of an illuſtration of Auguſtin's, who compares the elect and reprobate to two *debtors*, one of which is forgiven all, and the other made to pay all, by the ſame creditor.

Some ſtrong expreſſions of *Calvin* may be found in the firſt ſeventeen pages of the Oxford Diſſertation: but in thoſe expreſſions we ſee that deſire before-mentioned of making Reprobation, though proceeding

[h] Moſheim, Vol. 2, page 90, octavo, or Cent 5. 2. 5. 25.

[i] Theſe Monks were for Grace excluding Free-will; which is rather a *ſymptom* of their being for Predeſtination excluding Virtue.—*Janſen* felt as I did; ſee opening of Sirmond's Hiſtoria Predeſtinatiana.—Voſſius's Hiſt. Pelag. Lib. 7. is about Reprobation: and I think he is of my mind:—See Index to Hiſt. Pelag. "*Prædeſtinationem*," &c.

[k] Sect. VII. end.

[l] Lib. 1. Diſt. 40.

proceeding from the good pleaſure of God, an act of *juſt* puniſhment.

At *Trent* the Dominicans founded reprobation on the mere pleaſure of God, alledging the inſtance of *Eſau* reprobated before he was born.

There has been a diſtinction between *Supralapſarians* and *Sublapſarians*, from *Lapſus* the *Fall* of Man. The former held, or have been charged with holding, that God decreed the Fall of Man, and all its fatal conſequences; the latter, that God's decree *preſuppoſed* the Fall, or only *permitted* it, and determined the ſtate of different men in *conſequence* of it.—One *Twiſſe* has been reckoned a Supralapſarian[m]; he was Prolocutor to the Aſſembly of Divines in 1643.

This gives an idea of all *Mankind* taken collectively; with regard to a particular *inſtance*, Maſter *Fulke* ſpeaks plainly in his anſwer to the Rhemiſts on Rom. ix. 17.

"The purpoſe for which God *ſet up* Pharao is manifeſt in the text, *that in him he might ſhew his power*, &c. *God made all things for himſelf, even the wicked unto the evil day.* Therfore was Pharao, a veſſel of wrath ordained to deſtruction, verſ. 22. —His reprobation therefore was for the Glorie of God, his condemnation moſt *juſt*, for his obſtinate contempt of God and his word."

In reading the *Lambeth Articles* it was not eaſy to avoid reading the part about *reprobation* with that about election: becauſe one wiſhed not to leave a ſentence unfiniſhed. As this remark may apply to ſeveral inſtances, I will here *cloſe the Hiſtory* of Reprobation, and of the *Article*.

XXX. We

[m] Turretin, Locus 4 Queſt. 9. Sect. 23.—Turretin was a Predeſtinarian himſelf.—*Neal* gives a good character of Twiſſe.

XXX. We come then to the *Explanation.*

The *title* is, "Of Predeſtination and Election."—Predeſtination is ſometimes a *generic* term, including Election[n] and Reprobation; ſometimes it ſignifies only predeſtination to *happineſs*, which is its ſenſe here, as appears from its being joined with Election.—And alſo from the firſt expreſſion of the Article, "Predeſtination to *Life*."—Προορισμος is not in Scripture, but προοριζω is, and προθεσις.

XXXI. The *firſt paragraph* of our Article exhibits nothing more than a *ſeries of texts*, with a word or two connecting them together. To make ſuch a ſeries ſeems fair, yet it occaſions ſome impediment to that conception of the Article, which I think the right one. The texts of ſcripture, on which the doctrine of Predeſtination has been built, ſeem to me chiefly expreſſions of *ſentiment*, or eloquence, or even of *formality* and *decorum*.—Now to put ſuch expreſſions into a ſeries, muſt give them more appearance of *ſyſtem* and *theory* than they would have if each was read, with a right feeling, in its *place*.

When ſuch expreſſions occur as, "O King[o] *live for ever*,"—"the *moſt excellent Governor*[p] Felix," "moſt noble[q] Feſtus," &c. how ſtrange it would ſeem, if an Hiſtorian was to hold, that *Darius* was immortal, or that Felix excelled all other men as a Governor; yet when ſuch ſayings are connected together, the connexion gives each more ſpeculative meaning than it was intended to have.—I would not be underſtood to ſay, that *all* the texts

[n] Uſher's Body of Divinity under God's *Kingdom*, page 73, 7th Edit.—Arminius's Works, Diſp. 15. page 226. but Arminius prefers our ſenſe.

[o] Dan. vi. 21. [p] Acts xxiii. 26.

[q] Acts xxvi. 25.

texts introduced have an indefinite meaning; but only, that when the things they mention, are referred to the *predetermination* of God, *then* the meaning is indefinite.

Nor would I insinuate, that even *then* the meaning is *as* indefinite, as the meaning of the phrases just now mentioned, "*O King live for ever*," &c.; they are only mentioned to shew the *nature* of the inconvenience complained of, not to mark out the *degree* of it.

Still, however, it will be proper to shew, that the Compilers of our Article *did* follow Scripture[r].

XXXII. "*Predestination* to *Life*," implies that there is such a thing supposed, at least, as Predestination to *Death*.—Which is not here *denied*, but waved, or *omitted*.—The Reformatio Legum says, that wicked men used frequently to alledge *Reprobation*, as an excuse for their wickedness.

XXXIII. "*Is the everlasting purpose of God*"—we have "eternal purpose" Eph. iii. 11.—and *purpose*, in this sense, occurs several times. Rom. viii. 28.—ix. 11.—And Eph. i. 11.—"*everlasting*" is to be taken in a *negative*[s] sense, as that which has continued during a time to which we can conceive no limit.

"*Whereby*," will be allowed as a connecting word, not scriptural.

XXXIV. "*Before the foundations of the world were laid*;"—See Matt. xxv. 34.—Eph. i. 4.—2 Tim. i. 9.—This expression seems *indefinite*, and meant to be so taken.

XXXV. "*He hath constantly decreed*."—"*Constantly*," seems again a *negative* term, signifying a decree *not interrupted* in any way assignable by man:—*decreed* might be used as *implied* in predestination and

[r] See Oxf. page 20, &c. and bottom of page 74.
[s] Introd. to second Part, Sect. VII.

and purpoſe; but it may be referred to Jer. v. 22.; in LXX. προς-αγμα αιωνιον. *God's decree* is a ſort of *technical* term in Theology.

XXXVI. "*By his conſent*," βυλη Acts ii. 23.—Rom. xi. 34.—Heb. vi. 17.

XXXVII. "*Secret to us*," Deut. xxix. 29.—Amos iii. 7.—The ſecrecy is alſo implied in Rom. xi. 33, 34.

Secret ſeems to imply here that which belongs to *God's part*, in the Government of the world: to be oppoſed to *revealed*, for the guidance of *Man*; if what is called ſecret ever appear, it is by the *event* [t], or at moſt by faint intimation.

XXXVIII. "*To deliver from curſe*"—Gal. iii. 10, 13. with reference to Deut. xxi. 23. and xxvii. 26.

XXXIX. "*And damnation*," κατακριμα Rom. v. 16. 18.—but of this enough under the ninth Article.

XL. "*Thoſe whom he hath choſen in Chriſt*"—we have "*choſen in him*," Eph. i. 4.—the words "*in Chriſt*," were added to the Article in 1562, though they make what comes after ſeem rather an harſh repetition; in order, probably, to keep cloſe to words [u] of Scripture.—The term "*choſen*," is one of thoſe which were originally uſed of the *Jews*, and applied to *Chriſtians* in the way of compariſon or [x] alluſion.—The expreſſion, "thoſe whom he *hath* choſen," or, whom he hath *ſince* choſen, ſeems to me to imply, that the ſecret purpoſe of God is only to be looked upon as opened by the *event:* the publication of Chriſtianity is an

[t] "Made manifeſt by the effects." "then" (when a matter is come to paſs) "it is manifeſt what *was* God's will *before* concerning the matter."—This is Calviniſtic Uſher: Body of Divinity, page 41, 7th Edit.

[u] Oxf. page 20. [x] Taylor on Romans, Key, Par. 92.

an event which ought to be referred to the Divine Government, not limited by time. Whoever entered fully into this remark, would allow me to ſay, that predeſtination of men to be Chriſtians, ought not to be mentioned, or thought of, till they *are become* Chriſtians: agreeably to what was[y] ſaid under the tenth Article of preventing Grace; nay, that any *heathen* who pleaſes, may to-morrow *have*[z] *been* "*choſen*" from all eternity; that is, whoever becomes a Chriſtian in the common way, may, when he does become one, *aſcribe* his converſion to the goodneſs of God, acting before all time that can be limited.

"*Out of mankind*"—theſe words ſeem only for connexion.—They might have been omitted.

XLI. "*And to bring them by Chriſt to everlaſting Salvation.*"—Eph. i. 7, 10, 11, ſay the ſame thing, only in a manner not ſo ſuitable to the courſe of expreſſion in the Article: that true Chriſtians are to be *ſaved* eternally, is not a thing likely to be queſtioned by any ſet of Chriſtians. *Salvation* was one of the terms explained in the Appendix to the eleventh Article[a]. The word "*everlaſting*," is not uſeleſs, as men are ſometimes ſaid to be *ſaved* when they are only *admitted* into Chriſtianity.

XLII. "*As veſſels made to honour*"—Rom. ix. 21, 23. with reference to Jer. xviii. 1, &c.—Theſe texts deſcribe only *comparative* privileges, or diſtinctions; and thoſe diſtinctions muſt be ſuppoſed to be acquired in the *common way*, by a diligent uſe of *opportunities*, and then *referred*, indiſtinctly, to

[y] Art. x. Sect. xxxv.

[z] Rogers on this Article, mentions, as in error, thoſe who ſay, "it is is any man's power to be elected," page 80. — Theophylact is one, I ſee: which is a comfort.

[a] Sect. xviii. and Art. xi. Sect. xxi.

to the Divine Providence: though the reference to God will always be the ſtronger when we ſpeak of men *collectively*, and of diſpoſing or governing them[b].

We have now got what may be called a *definition* of our *cauſe*; of the cauſe of *Chriſtianity*, as exiſting in the Divine mind, in a *manner* unknown to us, from a *time* not to be limited by us. The *effects*, that is the *parts* of Chriſtianity, fall more within our comprehenſion. If they had been mentioned *firſt*, and then referred to their *unſearchable* cauſe, in *indefinite* language, our ideas would have been kept in better order; but it might be thought that an Article ought to keep to the *ſynthetical* method.

XLIII. "*Wherefore, they which be endued with ſo excellent a benefit of God*"—I ſee nothing in theſe words but connexion. "*They which be*," ſeems to imply uncertainty about *individuals*; whoſoever they may be, that are, in the ſight of God, true *Chriſtians*.

XLIV. "*Be called according to Goa's purpoſe*,"—the expreſſion is all taken from Rom. viii. 28. —See alſo 2 Tim. i. 9[c].—*invited*, offered *election*; Matt. xx. 16.—Taylor's Key, par. 97.—The invitation muſt have been primarily given to quit Idolatry and Paganiſm.

XLV. "*By his ſpirit working in due ſeaſon*"—1 Pet. i. 2.—the manner of referring converſion to God's ſpirit, has been mentioned[d] under the *tenth Article*: it muſt not interfere with endeavours, nor take place till the converſion is *paſt*.—"*In due ſeaſon*," I do not ſeem to ſee the whole purpoſe of

[b] Art. x. Sect. XLIX.

[c] 1 Cor. vii. 21. "*called*," is equivalent to becoming a Chriſtian.

[d] Art. x. Sect. XXXVI.

of inſerting theſe words; they fill up the ſentence to the *ear*; they occur ſeveral times in ſcripture, but not with regard to the working of the *ſpirit*.

XLVI. "*They through Grace obey the calling*,"—*obey* is in Rom. vi. 17. and *obedience* 1 Pet. i. 2.—It would not have been regular to have omitted the divine *aſſiſtance*.

XLVII. "*They be juſtified freely*:"—the expreſſion comes from Rom. iii. 24. but Rom. viii. 30. ſhould be kept in mind. Of Juſtification we have treated under the eleventh Article.

XLVIII. "*They be made the Sons of God by adoption*:"—Gal. iv. 5, 6.—Rom. viii. 15.—Heb. ii. 11. we were *born* in *ſin*. But the principal paſſage ſeems Eph. i. 5.

XLIX. "*They be made like the image of his only-begotten Son Jeſus Chriſt*:—this expreſſion comes from Rom. viii. 29.—but if we look at the 30th verſe, we have after *juſtified*, "*glorified*:" inſtead of which our church takes a paſſage out of the 29th verſe: from whence it ſeems probable, that they had the ſame notion of the paſſage, with *Taylor*; namely, that the 29th verſe deſcribes the *firſt* and *laſt* ſteps of our ſpiritual progreſſion; and that the 30th enumerates the *intermediate* ſteps: if this be right, it comes to the ſame thing ſaying, we ſhall be finally *glorified*, and, we ſhall be made finally like the *image* of Jeſus Chriſt.—See 2 Cor. iii. 18.—"*begotten*" may be oppoſed to *adopted*.

L. "*They walk religiouſly in good works*:"—this ſeems *implied* in becoming *Chriſtians*; but for the ſame reaſon the *twelfth Article* was inſerted, a *plain* expreſſion ſeems uſeful here:—I conceive a reference to Titus ii. 14. and iii. 8.—But Eph. ii. 10. has the moſt of Predeſtination in it.

LI. "*And*

LI. "*And at length, by God's mercy,*" — Tit. iii. 5.—1 Pet. i. 3.

LII. "*They attain to everlaſting felicity*"—Matt. xxv. 34. ſpeaks of the predeſtinated as attaining to endleſs happineſs, therefore is here the proper authority.

Before we proceed, we ſhould conſider whether the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics of Chriſtians admit of various *degrees*. *Salvation* does; *juſtification* has been ſaid to do, under the eleventh Article; why may not *Adoption?* good *works* allow of great variety.

LIII. We have now had a ſcriptural *delineation* of *Chriſtianity*, and we have ſeen the ſcriptural method of *referring* it to the divine foreknowledge and "everlaſting purpoſe." And what is the *uſe* of ſuch referring? that we are to ſee next. It may be uſed ſo as to do *good*; but it, or ſomething thought to be of the ſame ſort with it, may be uſed ſo as to do great *harm*. Our Article propoſes to attain the good, and avoid the evil.—The unſearchable counſels and foreknowledge of God do ſo far appear to man, as to become to him a moſt intereſting object of *contemplation* and reflexion; and if rightly contemplated, they may improve *Chriſtian piety*; if wrongly, they may promote *vice* and *miſery*. But let us purſue the expreſſions of the Article.

LIV. "*As the godly conſideration of Predeſtination, and our election in Chriſt*"—the ſort of contemplation allowed, muſt be "*godly*," that is, it muſt *preſuppoſe* true piety in the mind: and it muſt alſo preſuppoſe *admiſſion* into Chriſtianity, it muſt be contemplation of the *Chriſtian ſcheme*, as referred to the purpoſe of God; the word "*our*" was inſerted in 1562, but it might as well perhaps have been omitted; if it had been wanted to ſhew

that the meditation ought to be upon the *Chriſtian* plan, it would have been uſeful; but there are other marks of that; at preſent, it muſt either be taken imperſonally, and ſo add little or nothing to the ſenſe; or it muſt come too near affirming of *individuals*, what is only intended to be affirmed of *Chriſtians in general.*

LV. "*Is full of ſweet, pleaſant, and unſpeakable comfort to godly perſons*"—again, "*godly*;" joined to "*perſons*," as well as to "*conſideration*;" in order to make the diſtinction as clear as poſſible.

LVI. "*And ſuch as feel in themſelves the working of the ſpirit of Chriſt*"—we here diſtinguiſh between feeling *the ſpirit*, and feeling the *working*, *vim*, of the ſpirit; we mean, finding ſuch diſpoſitions and principles as we piouſly, though indiſtinctly, aſcribe to the aſſiſtance of the Holy Spirit, in the manner mentioned under the tenth Article: for fear of miſtake, the *effects* of the ſpirit, or the phænomena which are to make us truſt we are real Chriſtians, in ſome degree or other, are next ſpecified.

LVII. "*Mortifying the works of the fleſh, and their earthly members*,"—this is from Rom. viii. 16. —Col. iii. 5.

LVIII "*And drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things*;"—more phænomena, from whence we may judge whether we are ſuch Chriſtians as may derive *good* from contemplating the Chriſtian ſcheme as ſettled in the ſecret counſels of God.—Here ſeems to be an alluſion to John vi. 44.—"except the Father *draw* him."

LIX. "*As well becauſe it doth greatly eſtabliſh and confirm their faith of eternal Salvation to be enjoyed through Chriſt*,"—ſuppoſe then a Chriſtian, with ſuch diſpoſitions; would it really ſtrengthen his *faith* to refer the Chriſtian ſcheme back to God's planning

planning it before all time? it muſt; the *conſtancy*, the *duration* of it, muſt heighten his conceptions of its *ſtability* and *importance:* and the power, juſtice, and wiſdom of God muſt appear in a ſtrong and ſtriking light.

LX. "*As becauſe it doth fervently kindle their love towards God*;"—in like manner we may aſk, would it really inflame the devout *Love* of ſuch a Chriſtian as is here ſuppoſed, to dwell on the ſame contemplation? unavoidably: for ſuch a contemplation would ſhew him God as engaged, for endleſs ages, in acts of kindneſs to him; and would make the *connexion* between a kind Deity and him ſeem much more intimate than it was before.—"We love him, becauſe he *firſt loved*[e] us."

LXI. "*So for curious and carnal perſons, lacking the ſpirit of Chriſt.*"—Now we come to the perſons who may make a *pernicious* uſe of the ſecret counſels of God; in the firſt place, they are not *Chriſtians*; or if they have been *baptized*, they have not the *internal* qualifications of real Chriſtians: "lacking the ſpirit of Chriſt," may be ſtill farther cleared by comparing it with the ſixteenth[f] Article, "after we have received the Holy Ghoſt."—"A Chriſti ſpiritu prorsùs *alieni*," ſays the Reformatio Legum.

And the perſons who would do harm by thinking much on the ſecret counſels of God, are not only no Chriſtians, but they are *weak* or *wicked men*; *curious* or *carnal*.

"*Curious*," ſeems to be uſed with much meaning; and to deſcribe that kind of men, who are continually entering into ſuch abſtruſe and ſceptical ſpeculations as are apt to make *Atheiſts*; ſuch as unſettle

[e] 1 John iv. 19.

[f] Art. xvi. Sect. xix.

unſettle all principle; perplex, but never convince. —Re ipsâ curioſi, the Reformatio Legum calls ſuch perſons: ſpeculations of the ſort here meant frequently engender melancholy and miſanthropy, as well as impious murmuring againſt God.

"*Carnal*," means men of debauched morals; the Reformatio Legum informs us, that there were many ſuch, who took the turn of fataliſts at the time of the Reformation: "differti luxu;" having recourſe to Predeſtination as a covering, "maleficiis, et ſceleribus, et omnis generis perverſitati."

LXII. "*To have continually before their eyes the ſentence of God's predeſtination*,"—here the *object* of contemplation is changed: it was before the *Chriſtian* religion in the divine mind; here it is "*God's predeſtination*," in general; Fate, Deſtiny[g].—For bad men to have fatality before their eyes, is certainly what the following words expreſs.

LXIII. "*Is a moſt dangerous downfall*," *præcipitium*; the nature of a *precipice* is, that it does not neceſſarily deſtroy, but puts one in immediate danger of being deſtroyed; either by any one who chuſes to puſh one down; or by a ſlip of one's own.

LIV. "*Whereby the Devil doth thruſt them*," about referring evil to malignant Spirits, I have ſaid ſomething[h] before.—"*duce Diabolo*," Reform. Legum.

LXV. "*Either into deſperation*,"—deſpair is one natural conſequence of a perſon's perſuading himſelf that there is a fatality againſt him.

In deſperationem præſentem abjiciuntur *precipites*, Reform. Legum.

LXVI. "*Or*

[g] Or, according to Biſhop Hooper, "*fatal deſtiny*:"—See on the Commandments; or Heylin Quinq. page 557.

[h] Art. x. Sect. L.

LXVI. "*Or into wretchleſſneſs of moſt unclean living*,"—*wretchleſs*, means careleſs, negligent; in the Rhemiſh Teſtament on Rom. ix. 14. it is ſpelt *retchleſs*, which brings it nearer *reckleſs*, which occurs ſeveral times in Skakſpeare[1]: and a character in one of his plays, ſays, "I *reck* not"—for, I *care* not. At Sedbergh I have (above 40 years ago) heard often, "*never reck*," for "*never mind*," (pronounced, *neverack*), do not give yourſelf any trouble, or concern. In the *Latin*, the word is *ſecuritatem*:—"impuriſſimæ vitæ." The Reformatio Legum has, "ad ſolutam quandem et *mollem* vitæ ſecuritatem:" being *ſecure* is, properly, being without *apprehenſion* of danger; whether really *in* danger or not.

LXVII. "*No leſs perilous than deſperation*."—perhaps *more* perilous: God may pity the deſpairing fataliſt; he is more likely to be ſincere than the ſenſualiſt, who muſt, on numberleſs occaſions, act contrary to thoſe principles by which he excuſes his faults.

Perhaps "*deſperation*" may refer to "*curious*," and "*unclean* living," to "*carnal*."

Some paſſages from *Latimer* and *Hooper* might be read here. (quoted Heylin's Quinq. page 556, &c.; alſo Oxf. page 54, &c.; alſo Rhem. Teſt. on Rom. ix. 14. marginal note.)

LXVIII. We come now to the *third Paragraph*.—So far we have been concerned with duly *regulating* a ſublime and intereſting *meditation*, into which men are very *apt* to run.

It ſeems proper not to conclude the Article, without laying down ſomething relative to *practice*.

In the Article of 1552 the beginning of the third paragraph ſtood thus;

"*Furthermore*"

[1] See Ayſcough's Index, Stockdale's edition.

"*Furthermore*" "[though the decrees of Predeſtination be unknown to us,"]—it ſeems a pity the words in hooks were omitted; they tend to keep the thoughts in the right train: ſome puritanical influence might throw them out.

LXIX. "*We muſt receive God's promiſes in ſuch wiſe, as they be generally ſet forth to us in holy Scripture:*"

Promiſes are oppoſed to *decrees*; that which ſuppoſes man at *liberty*, to that which ſuppoſes him *fixed*. *Promiſes* ſeems to include *threats:* they are things to *act* from; *decrees*, while "ſecret to us," or "unknown to us" are only to be *contemplated*.

"*Generally* ſet forth;" to *all* men, not to any ſet of men particularly *favoured*. *Electing* is partial, *promiſing* extends even to thoſe at preſent "lacking the Spirit of Chriſt." Promiſes any man may *apply to himſelf*: decrees, no man may, in any *definite* manner.

LXX. "*And in our doings*," in our conduct, or practice, "in actionibus *ſuſcipiendis*," ſays the Reformatio Legum, more clearly.

LXXI. "*That will of God is to be followed*"—here is a reference to the *ſcholaſtic* diviſion of *will* into different kinds; which would not have been made except, as in St. *Paul's* time, perverſe men ſaid, "who hath reſiſted[k] his *will?*"—ſo in the age of the *Reformation*, men had urged the *Will of God* as an excuſe for their vices: "in *voluntatem* Dei criminum ſuorum culpam conferunt." (Ref. Leg.) —"*they ſay it is God's will.*" (Hooper[l]).—I will not take you into all the diſtinctions of Archbiſhop *Uſher*[m] on the ſubject of will, much leſs into

[k] Rom. ix. 19.
[l] See Heylin, page 556.
[m] Body of Divinity, page 40—48. 7th Edition.

into thoſe of *Thomas*[n] *Aquinas*; but ſome diſtinction ſeems neceſſary.—From what was ſaid in the *elementary introduction* to this ſecond part of the Articles, it will be eaſily allowed, that we may conceive a thing to be according to the will of God, or man, in two ſenſes, as he *permits* it, and as he *chuſes* it ſhould be done; *will*, in the former ſenſe, may be called *ſecret*[o] will, in God, as containing the rules of God's government, which muſt be ſecret to us; in the latter, *revealed*. The *ſecret* will of God we can only *contemplate*, in the manner now ſettled; the *revealed* will we muſt endeavour to *execute*. God wiſhes us to do what is right, for our own good.

LXXII. "*Which we have expreſsly declared unto us in the word of God.*" — "*diſertè* revelatam:" this means God's *revealed* will. *Diſertè*, Livy uſes for, *named*, mentioned by name; ſo it may be that will of God which is plainly *called* ſo, *called his will*, in ſcripture. However, it is oppoſed to God's will "*ſecret to us:*" to "*decrees*" "*unknown to us.*"

LXXIII. Having now gone through the ſeveral expreſſions of our Article, I conclude the Explanation with obſerving, that our Article does not *deny* either *abſolute* or *conditional*[p] Predeſtination. And that it is ſilent about *Reprobation*, has been already obſerved.

Ecclus. iii. 21—23, is like the general turn and ſcope of the Article.

LXXIV. According

[n] The Index to his works, under *Voluntas*, is really worth looking at as a matter of curioſity.

[o] Plaifere, page 342. 398.—See alſo Whitby on Five Points, Chap. 3. page 435; and compare John vi. 39. with Matt. xviii. 14. and 1 Tim. ii. 4.

[p] Waterland's Supplement to Arian Subſcription, page 60, with reference to Plaifere's Apello Evangelium.

LXXIV. According to our common order, I ſhould now come to *Proof*; but there is a difficulty in determining what is to be proved. Our Church can ſcarce be ſaid to lay down[q] *any doctrine* in this Article; it only gives a ſeries of *texts*, and declares againſt the *abuſe* of them. I will, however, lay down *one propoſition*, in order to have an opportunity of offering ſome remarks, tending to give the right *value* of thoſe texts which have occaſioned the ſtrict doctrine of Predeſtination: my propoſition may be,

God has predeſtinated Chriſtians, as ſuch, to Life.

But as all our knowledge of God's ſecret counſels is extremely indiſtinct, and as therefore this propoſition, in its preſent form, *ſeems* to have more meaning than it really has; and moreover, as in its preſent form it interferes with practical[r] *exertions*, I will put it into a form, better ſuited to the real ſtate of our knowledge, to the real ſenſe of ſcripture, and the active performance of the *duties* of human life. In its new form, then, it may ſtand thus;

LXXV. Whenever any thing important happens, or is conceived to happen, of a tendency to bring Chriſtians to heavenly happineſs, they may aſcribe that to the purpoſe of God; not limiting the duration of his purpoſe; if they do it with due *diffidence*, and in *circumſtances* ſimilar to thoſe in which the ſame is done in ſcripture.

Still our aſcribing is, from our ignorance of God's decrees and counſels, to be extremely *indiſtinct*, and in the *heart*, rather than the *head*; but proving this, will juſtify the generality of Churches in holding *ſomething* about Predeſtination.

The

[q] Sect. XVI. [r] Art. X. Sect. XXXV.

The only paſſages where predeſtination is mentioned *expreſsly*, are Rom. viii. 29, 30.—And Eph. i. 5. 11.—Theſe may therefore have a precedence; others may be mentioned in the order in which they lie in the ſacred volume.

Matt. xxv. 34.—John xvii. 11.—Acts ii. 23. and xiii. 48.—Rom. ix. 23.—Eph. i. 4. 9, or the whole, 4—11.—1 Theſſ. i. 4. and v. 9. (the latter quoted by Uſher repeatedly.) — 2 Tim. i. 9.—Titus i. 1.—1 Pet. i. 2.

Theſe may anſwer our purpoſe; and he who has a right notion of theſe, may apply it to all the reſt.

LXXVI. The remarks, by which I would endeavour to give the right *value* of theſe expreſſions of Scripture, are much the ſame with thoſe in the tenth Article; that is, applications of the elementary remarks, which make the Introduction to the ſecond part of our XXXIX Articles.

LXXVII. The *popular*[s] *language* of Scripture, does not lay down any *ſyſtem* of ſpeculative truth; but *each* expreſſion deſcribes ſome *feeling* for ſome uſeful *purpoſe:* we muſt ſee what this purpoſe is, in each inſtance, or we do not underſtand the expreſſion. There is really *no Theory of Predeſtination* in ſcripture; there are ſeparate pious *references* of important and happy events, to the unbounded foreſight and ſuperintendence of the Deity; and out of theſe, *men* have *formed* theories; but ſuch theories are merely *human*. Each paſſage of ſcripture aims at producing *Faith* and *Love*; and we have no right to uſe any paſſage for any other purpoſe.

If this is not the caſe, why are *trifling* events never referred in ſcripture to Predeſtination? God is as much the Author of trifling events as of important;

[s] Art. x. Sect. xxxix.

important; and it has in ſtrictneſs been as *long ago* determined, for anything we know, that a man ſhall be *ſix foot high*, as that he ſhall be a *Chriſtian*; yet the former kind of event is not referred to the divine counſels, the latter is: why, but becauſe it anſwers a good *purpoſe* to the Chriſtian, and not to the tall man. The fine reference of the privileges of a Chriſtian to the divine counſels, in *Rom.* viii. 28—30, is not for the ſake of *truth*, or *ſpeculation*; but for *animating* the converts to brave all the terrors of *perſecution*, rather than revolt from Chriſt. —And whoever ſees the paſſage for a moment without ſeeing it aim at the *heart*, miſſes what was principally intended, and of courſe ſees ſomething which the writer never thought of. The ſame may be ſaid of the *openings* of ſeveral Epiſtles; the heart is to be inflamed, by grand and affecting ſentiments, however indefinite, in order that the work may be *ſtudied* with a proper intereſt.

LXXVIII. In the texts on which Predeſtination is founded, great uſe is made of poſitive terms with *negative* ſignifications; as may appear from the beginning of the *explanation*. It would greatly tend to prevent miſconception, if we kept this conſtantly in mind; as alſo, that our meaning frequently is, when we refer to divine predetermination, no more than that it would be impious to *exclude*[t] the Deity; or fix on any time when he *did not* forſee, or intend to confer, ſuch or ſuch a bleſſing. The expreſſions concerning the "*eternal purpoſe*" of God, have had a ſenſe in the mind of the ſacred writer (as it appears to me) much nearer this, than any *Theoriſt* imagines.

LXXIX. Events aſcribed to the Predeſtination of God, are not to exclude *human agency*; they will be aſcribed to the one or the other, as the *occaſion*

[t] Art. x. Sect. XL.

occaſion directs; ſometimes to[u] *both*; and when only to one, the other muſt be underſtood to be *implied*.

Acts ii. 23. may afford us an inſtance. "Him being delivered by the determinate *counſel* and foreknowledge of God ye have taken, and by *wicked* hands have taken and ſlain."—The death of Chriſt is ſometimes aſcribed to the *will of God*[x], ſometimes to the *wickedneſs* of the Jews, (in different ſenſes indeed;) here to *both*. Whatever happens may be referred to God, in one way or other.—But the part which God acts in the Government of the world, does not in the leaſt affect the moral nature of man; that nature is God's immediate work; and men, when free, act under his government; whenever any good purpoſe is to be anſwered by referring an event to the government of *God*, it may be ſo referred, even though the act be *puniſhable*[y]; only in that *indiſtinct* way, which becomes our ignorance of the divine counſels: when any good purpoſe is to be anſwered by referring the *ſame event* to the choice of *man*, that may be done; and if it ſhould happen that a good purpoſe would be anſwered by referring *one* event at the *ſame time* to *both* the government of God, and the choice of man; the reaſon ſtill remains in force: this laſt mode of referring muſt intimate, that though man is ever ſo free, he is ſtill under the controul of God. By Acts ii. 23. the Jews were

[u] Art. x. Sect. XLI. referring to Introduction to ſecond Part, Sect. VIII.

[x] Rom. v. 8.—viii. 32.

[y] Art. x. Sect. L.—Hecuba, (Il. Ω. 209, &c.) ſays, that her ſon Hector was killed by *Fate*; yet ſhe deſires to *puniſh* Achilles on account of his death.

Œdipus is ſaid to have had an hard *fate*, but he is blamed juſt as if that had not been ſaid:—See Batteux, Ariſtot. Poet. page 258, Note.

were given to underſtand, that they had made a bad uſe of their freedom, but that they depended on God; he was their Governor, and would be their Judge.—Does not Mr. Pope's expreſſion, "*His ſcourge the tyrant*," mix divine and human agency equally? "*tyrant*" implies *wickedneſs*, which implies choice, or *human* agency; the Tyrant's being a *ſcourge* in the hand of God, expreſſes the government of God, or *divine* agency.

LXXX. We have no right to uſe any text of ſcripture without regard to the *circumſtances* in which it was uſed originally. How much change of circumſtances will alter the *ſenſe* of words, has been carefully[z] ſhewn. If then, in ſcripture, we only find *paſt* events, or events ſuppoſed to have happened, or *viewed as* having come to paſs, referred to the everlaſting purpoſe of God, we have no right to refer events to the ſame, without attending to that circumſtance.

This again, will prevent any *theory*, any *abſtract* propoſitions, about predeſtination, from being admitted.—This would have been reaſon enough for changing the form of our *propoſition*[a]: it was liable to be objected to thus; 'I know of *no ſuch* propoſition in *Scripture*; give me a *fact*, and perhaps I may *refer* that fact to God's unbounded foreknowledge.'—Matt. xxv. 34[b]. The kingdom of the bleſſed was "*prepared*" for them "from the foundation of the world;"—but this is ſaid when you are ſuppoſed to *look back* from the Day of Judgment. We might now ſay, *to any man*; be you *good*, and a kingdom *will have been* prepared for *you* from the foundation of the world; *but* if you become wicked, and are ſo finally, an "everlaſting *fire*"

[z] Book I. Chap. X. XI.—Introd. to ſecond Part, Sect. IX. —Art. X. Sect. XLII.

[a] Sect. LXXIV. [b] Compare 1 Cor. ii. 9.

fire" will *have* been prepared for you. Both the paſſages of ſcripture which mention Predeſtination expreſsly, have a *retroſpective* view; and refer, indiſtinctly, a preſent happy ſtate of things, to the divine ſecret counſels. And the ſame may be obſerved of thoſe *openings* of the Epiſtles, from which any thing relating to Predeſtination has been taken.

I think ſome of our Reformers and writers have ſeen ſomething of this notion. The *Neceſſary Doctrine* lays down[c], that a man ought not to judge that he is *elected*, but by his good diſpoſition, "and by the tokens of good and virtuous living."—When *Latimer* ſays we ſhould "*begin with Chriſt*"—he ſeems to mean we ſhould begin with the *effect*, and reaſon à *poſteriori*[d]. And Archbiſhop *Bancroft* meant ſomething of the ſame ſort at the Hampton-Court conference, by "*aſcendendo*[e]:" we *aſcend* from effect to cauſe. When we reaſon from a known effect to a cauſe imperfectly known, we *finiſh* with that which is above our comprehenſion; but when we *begin* from a cauſe not[f] underſtood, we are miſled in things which concern us immediately; and which are, in reality, level to our capacities.

Attention to circumſtances would hinder us from referring any *trivial*[g] events to God, or from making any references to his ſecret decrees, without a view to exciting ſome *good ſentiment*; according to what has already been laid down: and would

[c] Sect. XVI.

[d] Ser. on Septuages, quoted by Heylin, page 557.—Waterland, page 60. (Suppl. to Arian Subſcr.)

[e] Oxf. page 36.

[f] Introd. to ſecond Part, end of Sect. VIII.

[g] Fanatics have referred trifling events to God's decree or purpoſe, though I have no inſtance at hand: ſomething *ſimilar* to this we have had, Art. X. Sect. XXXIX.

would make us aware how things are referred to the *permiſſion* of God though contrary to what is moſt commonly called his *will*.

The more a man ſtudies the circumſtances in which our texts were uſed, the fewer references to the eternal purpoſe of God, will he be inclined to make.

LXXXI. I have ſeveral times ſaid, that I look upon the paſſages of Scripture from which the doctrine of Predeſtination has been derived, as being of the nature of *Eloquence*[h], and not of ſpeculation. That will be the caſe if thoſe paſſages are always calculated to excite good *ſentiments*. And they will be, of courſe, much *leſs plain* and perſpicuous, becauſe more indefinite, than practical directions; and therefore ought to be interpreted leſs literally. Indeed to interpret an eloquent expreſſion, ſo as to give it its true value, and neither more nor leſs, ſeems ſcarce practicable.—Rom. viii. 29, 30. is intended to have an effect upon the *feelings* of thoſe to whom it is addreſſed;—part of Taylor's paraphraſe on the next verſe is, "and what effect ſhould they ["theſe things"] have upon our *hearts*?" and though Mr. *Locke* on the opening of the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, gives predeſtination the limited ſenſe of God's purpoſe to take the Heathens into the Chriſtian Religion; yet he looks upon that whole epiſtle as a piece of eloquence and ſublimity.

He ſays, in his Synopſis, that St. Paul diſplays in it, "the glorious ſtate of that kingdom" (the kingdom of the Meſſiah) "not in the ordinary way of argumentation and formal reaſoning, which had *no place* in an Epiſtle writ as this is, all as it were in a *rapture*, and in a ſtile far above the plain *didactical* way; he pretends not to *teach* them any thing,

[h] Art. x. Sect. XLII.—Art. XVI. Sect. XXX.

thing, but couches all that he would drop into their minds, in Thankſgivings and Prayers; which affording a greater liberty and flight to his thoughts, he gives utterance to them in noble and *ſublime* expreſſions, ſuitable to the *unſearchable* wiſdom and goodneſs of God, ſhewn to the world in the work of Redemption." Mr. Locke himſelf makes one afraid of giving any very definite ſenſe to any lofty expreſſions in the *opening* of ſuch an addreſs eſpecially; though he may rightly point out what was to be a *diſtinguiſhed* part of the ſentiment excited.

Perhaps ſome paſſages may be made eaſy by obſerving the *Jewiſh* mode of referring all events to God. But this remark may be more uſeful when we ſay anything about *Reprobation.*

LXXXII. An obſervation made in the Introduction to this ſecond part of our Articles, may be of uſe here. Sometimes expreſſions of Scripture are not conſidered with ſufficient freedom, becauſe they are ſuppoſed to contain *new truths*, communicated immediately from Heaven.—I do not *perceive*, that any ſacred writer intended to teach any thing *new* with regard to the predeterminations of God; I mean, it does not ſtrike me that any ſacred writer has intended to give us any knowledge of the *Nature* of the divine decrees, which might not be derived from natural religion. The ſacred writers refer *new events* to the everlaſting purpoſe of God; but it does not follow that they taught new doctrines about them.

LXXXIII. I will now make a few remarks on the particular *texts* which I have produced in ſupport of my propoſition. — Of Matt. xxv. 34.— Acts ii. 23. and the opening of the Epiſtle to the Epheſians, I have already ſaid ſomething; Rom. ix. will come beſt under *Reprobation:* and the openings

ings of the firſt Epiſtle to the Theſſalonians, and the Epiſtle to Titus have nothing peculiar in them: I will therefore confine myſelf to John xvii. 11. (and ſimilar expreſſions;) Acts xiii. 48.—1 Theſſ. v. 9.—2 Tim. i. 9. and 1 Pet. i. 2.

In John xvii. 11. and other paſſages, Chriſt ſpeaks of Chriſtians as *given* him by his heavenly Father; a very proper and pious acknowledgement! eſpecially in *prayer*, or devout diſcourſe; but containing no more *doctrine* than would have ariſen from our *King's* thanking God, on the day of his public thankſgiving, for *giving* him millions of affectionate ſubjects, rejoicing in his recovery.

Acts xiii. 48. has occaſioned many diſcuſſions. I confeſs it ſeems to me to mean no more than that as many as *choſe* to become Chriſtians, were *allowed* to become Chriſtians; or as many as it *pleaſed God* to make ſo: *none* duly qualified were *refuſed*, though they were *Gentiles:* that was the *wonder*; that *Gentiles* ſhould be admitted to be God's people! "when the Gentiles heard this" (that they might be Chriſtians) "they were *glad*;" it was new to them at "Antioch in Piſidia;"—"they *glorified* the word of the Lord! and *as many* as were ordained to eternal life, believed:" not *one* or *two* diſtinguiſhed Heathens were admitted into Chriſtianity, but Heathens were admitted juſt as *Jews* would have been. Certainly the phraſe "*ordained to eternal Life*," to expreſs being inclined to become Chriſtians, is copious; and it is very ſolemn and *grand*; but ſo was the occaſion; nothing leſs was in agitation than what is called the rejection of the Jews, and the adoption of *all nations* upon the face of the earth: the phraſe might ſeem *natural* to Jews, in deſcribing converſion to a religion, the characteriſtic of which was,

to

to confer "*eternal Life*" on its votaries; it muſt needs ſeem highly decorous —"*Believed*," is put for, becoming believers.

Archbiſhop *Sharp*[i] and Mr. Parkhurſt[k] underſtand by ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰωνίου, as many as were in a due *diſpoſition* for eternal Life: a ſenſe ſupported in a very reſpectable manner[l].

But if τεταγμένοι meant *deſtined*, the expreſſion might mean no more than that all ſuch, of thoſe preſent, as were deſtined to be converted, were converted *then:* that is, the converſion of the Gentiles, as a ſolemn thing, might be referred, when it had actually happened, in the way already deſcribed, to the divine *purpoſe*. Being deſtined to *eternal Life*, might be uſed for being deſtined to *Chriſtianity*; as Chriſtianity produces eternal life of courſe, all things going right; no impediment ariſing on the part of the convert; being admitted into Chriſtianity is often expreſſed by the word *Salvation*[m]: which is generally equivalent to *eternal Life*.—As many as were deſtined to be *ſaved*, were admitted Chriſtians.—Acts ii. 47[n].

1 Theſſ. v. 9. is twice referred to by Archbiſhop *Uſher* in one page[o]: yet it is the concluſion of an *exhortation* to *arm*; therefore cannot, at leaſt, exclude *human agency*. It, with what goes before, conveys to me this idea. Remember the ſtate you are in; a ſtate of *warfare*; you are encompaſſed

[i] Sermons, Vol. 3. [k] Greek Lexicon.

[l] For Epictetus's ſenſe of τεταγμένος, ſee afterwards, Sect. LXXXIX.

[m] Art. IX. end of Sect. XXIV.—Art. XI. Sect. XIV.—Append. to Art. XI. Sect. VIII.—Locke on Eph. ii. 8.—Taylor's Key.

[n] One might ſuppoſe what effect the phraſe would have had, which was uſed with regard to *Lydia's* converſion, Acts xvi. 14.

[o] Page 73. 7th Edit. Body of Divinity.

paſſed with enemies; they may come upon you by ſurprize; put on "the whole armour of God;" if you are ſurprized, you will incur *diſgrace* and *puniſhment:* yet, believe me, that was not the *deſign* of your being placed in a ſtate of warfare; it was, that you might attain to honour, victory, reward. If this be right, there is a likeneſs between this paſſage and James i. 2, 12. "My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into divers temptations;" that is *trials*, difficult ſituations; "Bleſſed is the man that endureth temptation: for when he is tried, he ſhall receive the Crown of Life, which the Lord hath promiſed to them that love him." But no *doctrine* of *decrees* do I perceive.

In 2 Tim. i. 9. and what immediately precedes it, St. Paul exerts all his powers of *eloquence* to "*ſtir up*" Timothy to exerciſe his miniſterial functions: St. Paul himſelf was a *priſoner* when he wrote, and under *affliction* on account of the Goſpel; his miniſter ſeems to have been of a *mild* diſpoſition[p], we read of his "*tears*," of his drinking "no *wine*," of his being "*aſhamed*," of a "ſpirit of *fear*;" ſuch a ſituation of things was alarming; the miniſters of the Church which we are told of, ſeem to have been very few, conſidering the number of countries in which Chriſtianity was planted; *Timothy* was to be animated in the moſt forcible manner; the *Goſpel* was to be ſet in its higheſt light; to be ſhewn as exiſting in the divine mind time without end. Let any one read our text with theſe ideas, and he will ſee much noble *vehemence* in it, but no ſpeculative *teaching*; nothing didactic.

1 Pet.

[p] Compare the diſpirited expoſtulations of Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 4. 9, 10. 14.

1 Pet. i. 2. has been explained before[q]; with relation to our preſent ſubject, we have only to obſerve, that it is a fine *exordium* of an intereſting and affecting Epiſtle. The author inſtead of addreſſing the converts by the bare appellation of "*Chriſtians*," enumerates the moſt ſtriking *characteriſtics* of Chriſtians; and in order to *raiſe* their minds the more, he directs their views *back* to the *foreknowledge* of the heavenly Father. But teaches nothing *new*; points to nothing which is not *paſt*.

I *conclude*, that to *refer* in an indefinite manner, the important things of religion, to the *purpoſe* of God, may be highly proper and *decorous*, on great occaſions, as a part of *devotion* or *exhortation*; but that no *practical rule*, no *ſpeculative propoſition*, can be juſtly deduced from thoſe paſſages of ſcripture, which have given birth to the doctrine of Predeſtination.

LXXXIV. will now come to ſome proof of the *indirect* kind; or to the anſwering of a few *objections*: premiſing, that what was ſaid in anſwer to objections under the preceding[r] Article, might be of uſe here. The *immutability* of God uſed to be urged by the Predeſtinarians at the time of the Reformation, in favour of their notions.—It may be proper to keep in mind the objections in the tenth Article.

LXXXV. Is not what has here been laid down, too *intricate*[s] for common people to attend to? It does not ſeem ſo to me. Indeed, common people do in reality know as much of the ſubject, as the learned;

[q] Art. XI. Sect. XXII.

[r] Art. XVI. Sect. XXX.—In Heylin, 557th page.—Oxford, page 64.

[s] Art. X. Sect. XLV.

learned; if they would not frighten themſelves with fancies: and as all ranks may feel uneaſineſs from what they hear of predeſtination, all ſhould be provided with the remedy. In our method, all diſtinctions between abſolute and conditional Predeſtination are ſet aſide; all theory is diſmiſſed; nothing remains, but what is to be diſpatched by common feeling and common ſenſe. Nay, no man is required as matter of duty, to think *anything* about predeſtination; only it is a pity any one ſhould loſe a ſpecies of meditation, which "is full of ſweet, pleaſant and unſpeakable comfort," when rightly performed. Mr. *Whitehead* ſays, that ſages formed civil *ſocieties*,

By heaven's *permiſſion*[t], or by heav'n's *command*;

and afterwards,

And men are *born* to trifle, or to reign.

In theſe two lines are couched all the myſteries of God's different *wills*, and of each man's *deſtiny*; but they give no ſort of trouble, ſo long as men have no ſuperſtitious fear about them. If we would carry the feelings and ſenſe with which we read theſe, to Scripture, that would occaſion no greater perplexity. The plaineſt things ſeem abſtruſe whilſt we are obliged to examine them minutely; but uſe ſoon makes examination unneceſſary.

In ſhort we ſeem to have little to do in referring

[t] See William Whitehead's Works, Vol. ii. Elegy iii. addreſſed to the preſent Earl Harcourt, (1796.)—Marmontel puts theſe words into the mouth of one of his characters in his Tale of La Bergere des Alpes, (Contes Moraux, Tome 2. p. 50.) "Puiſque je *ſuis* Paſteur"—"il faut bien que je ſois *né* pour l'être."—Any common expreſſions, of the ſort here quoted, uſed without any idea of their being abſtruſe, or of their having relation to religious diſputes, are to our preſent purpoſe.

ferring events to God's purpoſe; but to let our feelings[u] *ply freely* to the caſe.

LXXXVI. Is not the general language of ſcripture as if men were[x] *free?* yes; and ſo is the language of our Article: "in our *doings*," we are to conceive ourſelves free; though looking *back*, we may acknowledge our dependence on God in every thing. Our moral and *accountable* nature is immediately[y] from God. The texts about predeſtination are *few*, and ſo are the occaſions on which they ought to be uſed. It may not be *neceſſary* to uſe them *ever*. Even thoſe men who favour predeſtination in the way of Theory, have ſuch faint notions of it that they do not *act* from it. *Calviniſts act* from free-will as much as other men: ſometimes men may *evade* their duty, by *pretending* to act from a belief of deſtiny, but I do not call this acting from a ſuch belief; they act from the notion of their being free, in every thing elſe.

Biſhop *Butler*[z] proves, that the doctrine of men's not being at liberty, if it could be true in *Theory*, muſt be falſe in *practice:* we muſt *act* as free; therefore there muſt be a fallacy ſomewhere.

LXXXVII. Is not the doctrine of Predeſtination hurtful to *Virtue?* No; Virtue is, in our Article, *preſuppoſed*, before men are allowed to meddle with Predeſtination: thoſe who are to hope that God's purpoſe will prove favourable to them, muſt "walk *righteouſly* in *good works*;" thoſe who may meditate

[u] Hecuba does this, in the paſſage mentioned Sect. LXXIX. Il. Ω. 209, &c. ſhe uſes *Fate* to raiſe a *ſentiment* of Conſolation: refers an event back to fate, though ſhe has no preciſe idea what Fate means.

[x] Art. x. Sect. XLVI.

[y] Sect. LXXIX.

[z] Analogy 1. 6.

meditate on the Chriſtian diſpenſation as having been planned in the divine counſels, muſt not be "*carnal*," but "*godly perſons*." And even theſe, according to our notions, ought only to dwell upon the decrees of God, *as far* as it will promote and ſtrengthen their virtue.—Beſides, thoſe texts which mention predeſtination, are ſo *linked* with the mention of virtue and holineſs[a], that no ingenuous man can take the former and leave the latter. If, on reading any text ſeeming to favour predeſtination, we aſk, *whoſe* virtue could this hurt? we ſhall find that it could hurt no one's, without ſome miſapplication.

LXXXVIII. Does not the doctrine of Predeſtination interfere with the duty of *Prayer*[b]? No more than with any other exertion for attaining good: no more than with any Virtue: indeed, according to the repreſentation of our Article, referring important and ſacred events to the divine purpoſe, is itſelf a ſpecies of *devotion*.

Of *Prophecy* I have ſaid enough before[c].

LXXXIX. I would laſtly propoſe the ſame queſtion which I have propoſed in ſome *preceding*[d] Articles; will not the doctrine before us, *diſguſt* thinking men? I think it *ought not*; particularly if our obſervation be true, that the ſcriptures give *nothing new* upon it. If, as a Chriſtian, I were aſked what I *meant* by Predeſtination, I ſhould give an anſwer which would ſuit natural religion, as

[a] Eph. i. 4. "he hath choſen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we ſhould be *holy* and without *blame*," &c.—See alſo Eph. ii. 10. *created* unto *good works*, "*ordained* that we ſhould *walk* in them:" and ſo in other paſſages.

[b] Art. x. Sect XLVII.

[c] Append. to Art. XI. Sect. XXVII.

[d] Art. IX. Sect. XL.—Art. X. Sect. XLIX.—See the Heads of Lectures in each Article, and the Appendix to Art. XI. Sect. XXIX.

as well as revealed. I ſhould ſay, I mean that, which, in the divine mind, is the cauſe of order and regularity; of ſuch order and regularity, as, in man, would be aſcribed to foreſight and predetermination. To this, events have been ever aſcribed, in all ages of the world. *Epictetus* uſes τεταγμενος much like the Author of the Acts of the Apoſtles[e]: and certainly reaſonable men could, in no age of the world, *deny* or *limit*, the predeterminations of God: If we can only turn reflexions upon the divine decrees to a *moral* purpoſe, we may be well ſatisfied.

XC. But while I am upon the ſubject of natural religion, I ſhould take notice of the famous difficulty ariſing out of the Divine *Preſcience*. If God foreknows my actions, they are fixed, though ſeemingly voluntary; therefore I have no *choice*, I am no *agent*. But, according to our notions, repeatedly[f] ſtated, we have no right to aſcribe to God a *certain knowledge* of our voluntary actions, if we have no ſuch thing ourſelves, nor any idea of ſuch a thing: do we know that it is not an *impoſſibility?* We have *analogies*, by which we can *conjecture*, with great probability, how men will act; and

[e] The paſſage, to which I mean to refer, I find in Cap. 21. in a Glaſgow Edit. with a Latin tranſlation, page 30.—In *Stanhope's* Edit. with *Simplicius*, about the 26th or 27th Chap.—Simplicius, in his comment, makes the paſſage belong rather to the *tenth Article:* to which might perhaps be referred the *Prayer*, with which Simplicius concludes his Comment.—(Lardner's Teſtimonies.)

Epict. Enchir. Cap. 22. Των δε βελτιςων σοι φαινομενων ἐτως ἐχῃ, ὡς ὑπο τῳ Θεῳ τεταγμενος εις ταυτην την ταξιν.

Here the true end of referring actions to God, ſeems to be diſcerned: not ſpeculative truth, but moral feelings; aſſiſting virtuous principles of human agency, and mixing it with divine.

[f] Art. XVI. beginning of Sect. XXX.

and God muſt have ſomething of the ſame ſort in an unbounded degree; but theſe muſt, by their nature, fall ſhort of certain knowledge. This is a different thing from *denying* the Preſcience of God, as the Socinians are ſaid to do: God has certainly all *poſſible* knowledge; but if he has a certain foreknowledge of our voluntary actions, it is a thing of a kind[g] of which we know nothing; and therefore if we admit it, and act from it, we are anſwerable for the conſequences. We muſt not, through a fear of detracting from the wiſdom of God, endanger our own morals; they are the principal objects of the divine adminiſtration.

XCI. I would alſo recall[h] to your mind, that there may be two different *trains* of thought, ſeemingly inconſiſtent with each other, and yet in either you may go on without coming to an end. Study the regularity of God's government, the conſtancy of the *rules* or laws of nature; you come to no end:—Study the *freedom* of voluntary agents, and the interpoſitions of God's particular *Providence*; again you come to no end; what remains, but that here, as in former inſtances[i], we leave two things to exiſt together as they may, though we are unable to make them fit and ſuit each other? aſſuring ourſelves, that there *is* ſome way of reconciling them, though we may not underſtand it; now, or ever.

What we have ſaid of the Divine Preſcience and Immutability[k], may put us into a right way of underſtanding the *Repentance*[l] of God, and other

[g] It is one of the *ſecret things* which belong unto the Lord our God. Deut xxix. 29.

[h] Book III. Chap. xv. Sect. IX.

[i] Sect. v. with references.

[k] Art. XVI. beginning of Section xxx.

[l] Compare Num. xxiii. 19. with Jer. xviii. 8, 10.

other things aſcribed to the Deity, which ſeem rather to belong to man. Each is, (as before, repeatedly) the cauſe, in God, of thoſe effects, which, in man, would be aſcribed to that quality: and each quality is aſcribed to God in any ſituation, as far as, in that ſituation, it is a *Perfection*.

We ſpeak of *Rules* of the Divine Government; but, in ſtrictneſs, we know no ſuch: when anything goes on *uniformly*, we preſume and ſuppoſe a rule; but we know not the mind of the Lord; the unexpected violation of that uniformity which we have obſerved, may be as much from rule, as the uniformity itſelf.

I conclude this topic of *natural religion*, with obſerving, that I do not ſee how the divine predetermination makes any difference in the doctrine of *Liberty and Neceſſity*, which was laid down[m] under the tenth Article; and therefore I do not ſay anything here on that ſubject.

XCII. I now come to ſay ſomething of the Doctrine of *Reprobation*. As in the tenth Article I reſerved to the laſt, the ſubject of referring *evil* to God, ſo I do in the preſent Article.—Evil has been referred to God as *inſpired*[n] by him, or *decreed*, the former part was treated in the tenth Article, the latter muſt be mentioned here.

I ſhould imagine, that as we have already ſeen the manner of referring *good* to God, if we gave ſome account of the *etymology* of reprobation, and ſhewed in what reſpects referring *evil* to God is more *complicated* than referring good, (and therefore how any ſcriptural expreſſion aſcribing evil, ſhould be conſtrued *leſs ſtrictly* than one aſcribing good,) we ſhould, with the help of what has been already ſaid, be prepared to examine any particular *texts* of ſcripture.

Probo

[m] Art. x. Sect. XLIX.

[n] Art. x. Sect. L.

Probo ſignifies to *try*, and ſo, in the common courſe of things, to *approve:* a *tried friend* is an approved friend.—*Reprobo* is, *after trial*, to throw away, as refuſe, that which has not anſwered the trial.

In the trial of *metals*, what is thrown away, is in Engliſh, called *droſs*, in Greek[o], αδοκιμον (αργυριον).—In any conteſts, in *running*, &c. the loſer was called αδοκιμος; to this St. Paul ſeems to allude when he ſays, of himſelf, μηπως αλλοις κηρυξας αυτος αδοκιμος γενωμαι[p]. *Man* is in a ſtate of *probation*; if he does tolerably well, he is δοκιμος, but if he is ſo bad as to be deemed incorrigible, he is αδοκιμος, or *reprobate*[q]. I do not ſee why *Locke* and *Taylor* ſhould run away from this ſenſe; there is nothing more frightful in it, than in the expreſſion, "*he gave them up*;" when it is ſeen what they were given up to.

Reprobation ſeems generally to give more alarm, by the *ſound*, than *condemnation*; yet one had rather be neglected as *refuſe*, than adjudged to poſitive puniſhment. A man may be *comparatively* reprobated; as when another who is *preferred* to him, is ſaid to be *elected*; reprobated, being the correlative.—Nay, one might conceive one who is *reprobated* in compariſon of *one* man, to be *elected*, in compariſon of another. As a thing thrown aſide, may be uſed for ſome other purpoſe from that it was tried for; and in preference to ſomething elſe.

XCIII. The difference between referring *good* and *evil* to God, ſeems to conſiſt in this; God may have *evil* aſcribed to him, becauſe none can happen

[o] Prov. xxv. 4.—Iſ. i. 22. according to the LXX.

[p] So that with us, a *diſtanced* horſe, is a *reprobate horſe*.

[q] In our *Homily*, *reproveable* is the word for reprobate.—On Faith, beginning; from Titus i. 16.

happen which he does not *permit*, and which, therefore, does not, in ſome ſenſe, make a *part* of his *Government*; (and every part of his Government is *good*;) or becauſe there is no evil which he does not *controll*, ſo as to prevent its operating beyond certain *limits*[r]. Evil may alſo be aſcribed to God, when he *puniſhes* it, and thereby produces *good*; but more directly, when the evil aſcribed is uſed *as* a *puniſhment*. It is alſo aſcribed to him when he brings *incidental* good out of it. *Language* muſt, to be ſure, be *far* from *literal*, which aſcribes *evil* to God in *any* ſenſe; but it is uſually a *fact* which is aſcribed, and that fact is good in ſome *reſpects* and evil in others. *At bottom*, it is only *good* which is aſcribed to God, or what is good to him who aſcribes it; and common ſenſe ſees this, though it may not be conſcious of every ſtep in the proceſs. When God only *permits* evil, there is, no doubt, good, if it were only in the liberty, accountableneſs, &c. and in every other caſe juſt now mentioned, the good appears more plainly.

But *good* is aſcribed to God more ſimply and *directly*; it is unmixed; he not only permits it, but *rewards* and encourages it; ſo that both the liberty of conferring and attaining good, and the encouragements to uſe that liberty, are his.

Though *language* in which evil is aſcribed to God, is more imperfect than language in which good is aſcribed; yet even the latter is capable of being perverted:—God is "the author of *peace*;" then what occaſion, ſays a man who wants to *evade* his duty, for me to be a *Peace-maker*?—perhaps this

[r] Some references might be made from this Section, and the next to the 50th Section of the tenth Article; but the beſt method would be, to look at that before reading this part.

this evaſion might be too groſs to paſs; but others do paſs, which are of the ſame *kind*.

When one man is *preferred* to another, we ſometimes hear the comparative diſadvantage called *evil*, *injury*, or even *puniſhment*. Of ſuch evil God may be the immediate author. He may prefer one of his creatures to another, or make them into different *ranks*, in any kind of life. (Rom. ix. 15.)

There ſeems to be Reprobation ſpoken of *à priori* and *à poſteriori*.

XCIV. Some have had a notion, that God, by a *direct act*, ordains a number of men to miſery; but there is no warrant in ſcripture for ſaying any ſuch thing. Take an *evil*, a *fact*, and you may *refer* it to the divine government, with that indiſtinctneſs which your ignorance demands, if you can anſwer a good *purpoſe* by ſo referring it; if you can excite a pious or virtuous *ſentiment*; but not otherwiſe. An attention to *circumſtances*, is required in referring *evil* as well as in referring good[s]; nay, a greater degree of attention. But let us take ſome *inſtance*.

Let us take firſt the *rejection of the Jews*; as a great part of the doctrine of reprobation has been taken from ſcriptural expreſſions relating to that event. The *plain fact*, if told in common language, was, the Jews, or part of them, rejected the Chriſtian religion: but when this fact was taken in a religious light, and conſidered as part of God's government, and referred to God, the expreſſion then was, *God rejected the Jews*; which to the Jews themſelves would ſeem natural and eaſy language.

The Jews, in this caſe, were *reprobated*; and important good, no doubt, they loſt;—but they might

[s] Conſider Matt. xxv. 41. in this light, as before, Section LXXX.

might any of them embrace Chriſtianity when they pleaſed; and then, when their converſion was ſpoken of in a religious light, and as part of divine government, they would be ſaid to have been *elect*, *predeſtinated*, according to God's purpoſe. In both caſes, of rejecting and embracing Chriſtianity, the *fact* muſt come *firſt*, and then be referred back to the divine counſels; in ſuch reference language implying divine agency would be rightly uſed.

XCV. Now let us take a few particular *texts*.—I will take them chiefly, or entirely, from Archbiſhop *Uſher's* proof of Reprobation[t], which he favours. I do not perceive Jude 4, amongſt his texts; which I wonder at.

Prov. xvi. 4. gives me no other idea than this: God's government is univerſal; what he *created* he always deſigned to ſuperintend: he created all things as ſubjects of his government; it extends to the puniſhment of the wicked. Though God *hates* ſin, yet the permiſſion of it, and the puniſhment of it when committed, is as much a part of his plan, as even the rewarding of goodneſs.

Let us now go to the *ninth Chapter to the Romans*, and firſt take the 13th verſe, "*Jacob* have I loved, but *Eſau* have I hated." This *whole chapter* is written to prove, that God might *ſet aſide* the Jews, or leave them out of the kingdom of the Meſſiah, that is, *reprobate* them, notwithſtanding his *promiſes* to their forefathers. Their notion ſeems to me to have been this;—the Chriſtian religion cannot be the true, or if it is, we need not be anxious about it, becauſe we muſt be of the true, in conſequence of the promiſes of God. No, ſays St. Paul, that reaſon is not valid; you cannot depend upon *deſcent*, becauſe you inherit from *Jacob*,

[t] Body of Divinity, page 73, 74. 7th edition.

Jacob, and he was not regularly deſcended from Abraham; *Eſau* was his elder brother:—that inſtance of quitting the direct line, St. Paul well knew, the Jews would not object to; the preference of the deſcendants of Jacob, that is, of the Iſraelites, to thoſe of Eſau, or the *Edomites*, was a favourite ſubject: but, ſay the Jews, Eſau was diſinherited, becauſe of his bad *character*: that, replies the Apoſtle, was not the reaſon; for the diſinheriting was announced before the birth of the twins; therefore God may make a ſimilar change when it ſeems good to him. The expreſſion of the Apoſtle, "Jacob have I loved, but Eſau have I *hated*," is, very properly, borrowed from a *Prophet*[u]; and the language of the prophet, means, that the Iſraelites were a much more proſperous *people* than the Edomites:—there is not the leaſt in the paſſage of any *individuals*, or of any puniſhment in a future ſtate.

The 17th verſe is another ſupport[x] of Reprobation: It contains another inſtance, which the Jews would readily adopt, the puniſhment of the *enemies* of their forefathers, the puniſhment of the *Ægyptians*, and *Pharaoh* their King.—It is mentioned in the Book of *Exodus*[y]. God *raiſed up* Pharaoh in order to ſhew his power; the *plain fact* was, while Pharaoh was under the rod, under any of the plagues, he was *humble* and ſubmiſſive; when they were remitted, he *exalted*[z] *himſelf*, and grew arrogant again.

But though in plain language he *exalted himſelf*, yet when the tranſactions were conſidered as a part of God's government, the expreſſion was, *God* exalted him, or *raiſed him* up; by allowing him that

[u] Mal. i. 2, 3. Obadiah ſeems *all* on this ſubject.
[x] Rhemiſts on the place.—Uſher, page 74.
[y] Exod. ix. 16. [z] Exod. ix. 17.

that relaxation from puniſhment, which occaſioned his inſolence. And this was very ſuitable to Jewiſh phraſeology. The effect of Pharaoh's inſolence was, to make God's protection of the Iſraelites much more ſtriking, and much more *celebrated* than it would otherwiſe have been; which is, in like manner, as a part of divine government, thus expreſſed, "*that* my name may be declared throughout all the earth."—Now why might not God, in the ſame ſenſe, *raiſe up the Jews?* the more they exalted themſelves, and the more obſtinate they grew in rejecting the Goſpel, the more would the fame of the Goſpel be declared throughout the world. Indeed the ſituation of the *Jews* has been, and is, moſt wonderful; and has, in fact, greatly aſſiſted in proving the divine authority of the Goſpel. But the paſſage before us is ſo little to Reprobation, in the uſual ſenſe of the word, that we have loſt all idea of reprobation merely by examining it.

We muſt take one more paſſage out of this famous chapter; the 22d verſe: "*veſſels of wrath, fitted to deſtruction:*" but we muſt look back, perhaps as far as our laſt inſtance, the 17th verſe. My idea of the whole paſſage, is this;—a *taunting* Jew had ſaid; we make God's name[a] to be glorious? do we ſo? then God cannot be angry with *us*; in truth, as yet, (continuing the ſarcaſm) we have ſuffered no *great* harm!—On this the Apoſtle is indignant; Inſolence! he exclaims, You know your cavil to be inſolent, as well as ſophiſtical: but dare you inſult *God!* are not you, according to your own prophets, in his hands, as clay in the hand of the Potter? may not you be appointed to a more or leſs noble office? He might *deſtroy* you, and

[a] Ezek. xviii. a Jew makes a taunting cavil; ſee the ninth Art. Sect. XXXVIII.

and he does not; is this your complaint? forgive him this wrong: it may not continue; *He* only knows how near your deſtruction is; He only knows how ſoon you may weep over your *Temple*, and find not one ſtone left upon another! Becauſe deſtruction is not actually arrived, do you conclude that Chriſtianity is not the kingdom of the true Meſſiah? that would be a moſt unwarrantable concluſion. Remember how God acted with the *Ægyptians*; if, in the ſame manner, he makes your refuſal of the Goſpel, the means of promoting its *honour*, you cannot, after praiſing the meaſure in one caſe, blame it in another, exactly ſimilar.

Thus we ſee, that the paſſage has no relation to *individuals*, or to *Chriſtians*, or to puniſhment in a *future life*. There is ſome appearance as if St. Paul had not been wholly without an idea of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem; but how far he was informed of that event, does not appear. One thing ſeems evident, that St. Paul, by his reaſoning was endeavouring to promote *converſion* to Chriſtianity; and from thence we may conclude, that any *individual* Jew might have eſcaped from any kind of deſtruction which was impending over the Jewiſh *people*.

We have now only 1 Pet. ii. 8. and Jude 4, remaining: they are ſo much alike, that I will take them together: indeed they ſeem ſo little different from Prov. xvi. 4. that if that is explained, ſo are theſe. All three conſiſt in referring evil to God, in order to ſhew, that the moſt daring offenders cannot *exempt* themſelves from the reſtraints of his Government. You will find learned[b] and ingenious ſolutions of them all; but I am moſt inclined to ſolve them from what has been laid down, about

[b] In Benſon, Le Clerc, Whitby on the five points, &c.

about the difference between referring[c] good and evil to the Supreme Being. When men run into great crimes, they are apt to *triumph* in their freedom from thoſe fetters, in which they fancy the good are confined: nothing tends more to humble them, and make them ſober-minded, than to make them feel, that they are totally under the government of God; and that, though they are really guilty, yet their very crimes may be inſtruments of good in the hands of God; this makes them feel impotent and deſpicable; and the more if they are made ſenſible of the *boundleſs duration* of the divine ſchemes of Government.—Theſe are the ideas which ſeem to me to prevail in the minds of the ſacred writers when they throw out, "*appointed*" to this evil; "of old *ordained* to this condemnation."

And we ſhould really conſider what a world we ſhould be in, if God was *ignorant* of man's wickedneſs; or if the profligate were really *lawleſs*; or if evil was ſimply evil; if no good came out of evil; or if a ſin was never made the puniſhment of a ſin. It frequently happens, that the *good* which ſprings out of evil incidentally is ſo great, that we dare not wiſh the evil had not happened. To be ſure when we expreſs God's permiſſion, regulation, improvement of evil, by ſpeaking as if he were the *author* of evil, our language is very imperfect; but ſo indeed is the generality of our language; often, I apprehend, not leſs imperfect: cuſtom reconciles us to it; and practiſing upon it, ſerves to define it: the caſe might ſoon be the ſame with language aſcribing evil to God. It has been eaſy and familiar to the Jews; it might become ſo to us.

XCVI. At

[c] Sect. XCIII.

XCVI At length we come to our *Application.* If what has been[d] ſaid is juſt, we may have here an Article of *natural religion*[e].

'I have already[f] returned thanks to Providence for making me a member of my religious *aſſociation:* Its laws and regulations muſt improve me and bring me to happineſs; but I cannot think that thoſe laws exiſted *firſt* when I firſt knew them.—how *long* then may the plan have exiſted in the divine mind?—the heavenly planner only knows!

'When I reflect on the bleſſed Inſtitution, as *ſettled* by divine wiſdom, before all time, I am filled with ſacred *wonder:* could I flatter myſelf that I was a worthy *member* of it, I ſhould be happy; I try my *principles* and my *conduct*; and in proportion as they ſatisfy me, I feel a *confidence* in God as the protector of it, and an *affectionate* gratitude towards him.—Yet I can ſee, that if a *bad* man was to act from a notion that all things are ſettled, it could only lead him to *deſpair*, or *licentiouſneſs.*'

'No; the decrees of God may be an intereſting ſubject of *contemplation* to a good mind; but *practice* muſt ſpring from the endeavours of man, animated by the hopes of *pleaſing* God, and being *rewarded* by him.'

XCVII. A Chriſtian might ſay thus;

'That I am a member of the Church of Chriſt, is matter of ſincere rejoicing to me: what a privilege! to be *invited* into ſuch a ſociety, to be conſidered

[d] End of Sect. LXXXII.

[e] Theſe forms proceed according to the hint at the end of Sect. XLII: firſt comes the *fact*, then the *cauſe*, in God's purpoſe, formed before any aſſignable time: then the good and bad *uſe* of *contemplating* God's purpoſes, or *decrees:* then the nature of *practical rules.*

[f] Art. XIII. Sect. XXVII.—Art. XII. Sect. XXVI.—Art. XI. Sect. XXX.

conſidered as free from any great *fault*, to be regarded in the light of a *brother* to my Lord and Saviour! to be led naturally to *imitate* his perfections, and to be put into a way which leadeth to eternal life!—The importance of the bleſſing ſtill grows upon me when I conſider, that the Church of Chriſt has been an object of attention in the Divine mind ever ſince the Fall of our firſt Parent.—So far I am expreſsly taught; but had not the Chriſtian diſpenſation been conceived or planned *before* the Fall? I muſt not ſay or think it: I look back, and time keeps opening upon me: I can fix no period when it ſeems at all probable that the gracious deſign had a beginning.'

'Chriſtianity, exiſting in the divine mind before the foundation of the world, and opening gradually upon mankind, is the moſt *auguſt* and *affecting* object which an human being can contemplate.—And when an examination of my heart and actions gives me any reaſon to think that I am really a member of it, my *hope* is confirmed, and my devout *affections* enlivened, by the *conſtancy* of the divine benevolence. Nevertheleſs, it is intelligible how an opinion, that all things are fixed by the Deity, may lead a man into a ſtate of *deſpondency*, or into a *negligent* and diſſolute courſe of life.'

'Though therefore I am happy in having ſuch a ſubject of *meditation*, to raiſe my mind to piety and devotion; yet I ſhall endeavour to ſtrengthen and improve my *practical* principles by attending to the *promiſes* of God, and to the revealed deſcriptions of that conduct, which he wiſhes man to purſue, for the improvement of human happineſs.'

XCVIII. With regard to *mutual conceſſions*, I would not ſay much;—*Dupin*[g] makes no objection to this Article: there is great room for *candour* in debating

[g] Moſheim, Vol. 6. page 77, octavo.

debating about it. If divine agency does not *exclude* human, nor human[h] divine, and both are *indiſtinct*, different *modes* of *referring* events, to God and man, ſhould be allowed; and different *phraſes*, according to mens different feelings and conceptions. St. John ſeems to have been of an affectionate temper, and that influences his ſtile.—And if you and your adverſary may get into two different *trains*, of thought and expreſſion, and both be[i] right, to what purpoſe is diſpute? Our form of aſſent ſeems to be ſuch (as we ſaid on a former occaſion[k]) as an *Heathen* would ſubſcribe to, except in thoſe particulars which muſt be *common* to *all Chriſtians*; and if it be ſo, no denomination of Chriſtians need diſſent from it. But till it appear how our method would be accepted, one cannot tell what conceſſions to propoſe.—Even *Uſher*, ſpeaking[l] of Reprobation, ſeems to have had ſome ideas of referring evil to God, which might, with ſome tempering, be made to coaleſce with ours. Indeed our method has favoured Reprobation as much as Election; and poſſibly might be acceptable to ſome as ſetting aſide *no texts* of ſcripture, in order to favour commonly-received notions of human[m] Philoſophy.

XCIX. We come, in the laſt place, to *Improvements*. Shall we, in imitation of *Melancthon*, *ſtrike out* this ſeventeenth Article? I had much rather our method of explaining and defending it, were accepted. The mind wants ſomething to *lean* upon with regard to the divine Counſels; and thoſe paſſages of Scripture which ſpeak of them. The diſquiſitions and meditations on ſuch paſſages might

[h] Sect. LXXIX. LXXXVI.
[i] See Sect. XCI. referring to Book III. Chap. XV. Sect. IX.
[k] Art. X. Sect. LIII.
[l] Page 74, Body of Divinity, 7th Edition.
[m] Dr. Powell's 3d Charge.

might be called a fine ſpecies of *devotion:* they are all ſentiment and ſublimity.—One would do a good deal to ſuit weak brethren; but there is no ſufficient reaſon why thoſe who are *not* weak ſhould loſe ſuch ſublime devotion: eſpecially as thoſe who are perplexed by meditations on the benign purpoſes and plans of the Supreme Being are under no ſort of *obligation* to dwell upon them. (Sect. LXXXVI.)

A *tranſpoſition* of the former and latter parts of the firſt[n] paragraph, might prevent ſome wrong conceptions.

It muſt be *tried*, in Natural Theology, Heathen writings, the Scriptures, and common[o] diſcourſe, whether the obſervations which have been hazarded are juſt.

C. When *Milton* aſſigned to his *fallen* angels the employment of reaſoning[p] on our preſent ſubjects, I hope he did not mean to deny, that, when *rightly* conceived and made the ſubject of our contemplation, they are "full of ſweet, pleaſant, and *unſpeakable*[q] *comfort*."

[n] Sect. XLII.

[o] Art. X. Sect. LIV.

[p] Paradiſe Loſt, Book ii. 557.

[q] It may be a ſatisfaction to ſome hearers of the Lectures, who took notes, to know, that the five laſt Sections of this 17th Article, were omitted April 1, 1791, for want of time; even though the Lecture that day was ſupernumerary.

ARTICLE XVIII.

OF OBTAINING ETERNAL SALVATION ONLY BY THE NAME OF CHRIST.

THEY alſo are to be had accurſed, that preſume to ſay, That every Man ſhall be ſaved by the law or ſect which he profeſſeth, ſo that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of Nature. For holy Scripture doth ſet out unto us only the Name of Jeſus Chriſt, whereby men muſt be ſaved.

---

1. In treating of this Article we will proceed in our uſual method, though much of what was ſaid upon the thirteenth Article might be applied here. The thirteenth ſeems to relate to *individuals*, and this to members of *Society*; but yet as theſe may be the ſame perſons, their neglecting Chriſtianity in the capacity of individuals, muſt be nearly connected with their neglecting it in their ſocial character.

According to what was ſaid at the opening of the Introduction to the ſecond part of our Articles, the THIRD PART begins here.

It has probably been the cuſtom in many different ages to ſay, that all honeſt men will be ſaved, whatever religion they may be of; but this ſentiment muſt be moſt prevalent when men are moſt

moſt divided into religious parties; then the difficulty of forming a judgment, is moſt ſtriking: —it muſt, on this account, have been very prevalent at the time of our *Reformation*, and that æra is probably of the moſt conſequence to us at preſent; nevertheleſs, if we make hiſtorical remarks, we may as well look back as far as we can.

II. Biſhop *Burnet* ſays, that "The impiety that is condemned in this Article was firſt taught by ſome of the Heathen Orators and *Philoſophers* in the fourth Century," who pleaded, that God was more honoured by *various modes* of worſhip, than if all men agreed in one mode.—I ſhould rather apprehend, that the compilers of our Article would have chiefly in view ſome error held by *Chriſtians*, or by ſuch as might have the ſcriptures propoſed and urged to them; ſcriptural authorities would only affect perſons ſo ſituated.

Philaſter does give an account of a Sect called *Rhetorians*, who held, that *all ſects* were right; and ſome have imagined, that theſe were *Rhetoricians*, or Orators of the fourth Century; but Philaſter lived in the[a] fourth Century himſelf, and places this ſect much earlier. Our buſineſs does not ſeem to be to enter into nice queſtions on eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; and therefore I ſhall content myſelf with referring you to Lardner's account[b] of Rhetorians, and with obſerving, that though *Auguſtin* thinks it incredible that any ſect ſhould juſtify all ſects; it has often appeared to me, that each ſect *ſets out* on ſome right principle, though it may afterwards go too far, or deviate from the right path.

III. We may now take notice of the *fifth Century*. One part of the *Pelagian* controverſy was about

[a] A. D. 380, Lardner. [b] Works, Vol. 9, page 232.

about the *univerſality of Redemption*; was intended to determine, whether *all men* were *redeemed* by the Death of Chriſt, and whether all men were *called*. I believe diſputes on ſuch matters referred chiefly to *Predeſtination*; and were intended to determine whether Chriſt could be ſaid to have died for the *reprobate*; but yet perhaps they might have *ſome* relation to our preſent Article; for if all men were ſo redeemed by Chriſt as to be upon *one footing*, it would not ſignify what religion any man was of.—It ſeems, moreover, as if the Pelagians had held notions which were not approved by the orthodox[c], about the juſtification and Salvation of the holy men mentioned in the Old Teſtament. Yet this Salvation was, in ſome meaſure, aſcribed to *Chriſt*; to their having *foreſeen* his coming.

IV. *Mohammed* lived partly in the ſixth Century, and partly in the ſeventh, (571—633). Bp. *Burnet* obſerves, that the Koran repreſents "all men in all religions" as "equally acceptable to God, if they ſerve him faithfully in them." He alſo remarks, that this candour was intended as an *inducement* to embrace Mohammedaniſm, and was followed by great ſeverity towards thoſe who were deſirous to apoſtatize. We may give a paſſage from the Koran to our purpoſe; "Sciendum generalitèr, quoniam omnis rectè vivens, Judæus ſeu Chriſtianus, ſeu lege ſuâ relictâ ad aliam tendens, omnis ſcilicet Deum adorans, bonique geſtor, indubitanter divinum amorem aſſequetur[d]."

V. But, for the reaſon already aſſigned, we are chiefly concerned with the age of the *Reformation*. In

[c] See Auguſtin's Works, Ed. Antv. Vol. 10.—Appendix, page 75. in a Pelagian Creed, or Confeſſion of Faith.

[d] Azoara 2d. page 10, Edit. Bibliandri. Zurich 1564, quoted by Forbes, Lib. 4. cap. 10.

In the *Racovian*[e] Catechiſm it is laid down, that ſince the coming of Chriſt no one is juſtified without faith in him, but before his coming, good men were juſtified by faith in[f] *God.*—*Eraſmus* not only ſpeaks of *Cicero* as inſpired[g], but as probably *ſaved.*—*Paulus Jovius* died in the year 1552, when King Edward's Articles were publiſhed; in his lives of famous men, he gives an account of *Galeottus Martius*, who was perſecuted by ſome monks (though accidentally protected by Pope Chryſtus, or Sixtus the Fourth, as an old acquaintance) for teaching, in a Book of ſacred and moral philoſophy, "omnibus gentibus, integrè et puritèr veluti ex juſtâ naturæ lege viventibus, æternos cœleſtis auræ fructus paratos:" &c. this perſon died in 1478.—We have already[h] mentioned the decrees of the Council of *Trent*; I do not ſee any thing more to our purpoſe than what was quoted under the thirteenth Article[i].

The *Scotch* confeſſion ſeems very ſtrenuous on the neceſſity of being of the true Chriſtian church in order to attain[k] Salvation. "Extra quam" (eccleſiam) "nec eſt vita nec eterna felicitas.—Itaque prorsùs *deteſtamur* illorum *blaſphemiam* qui dicunt homines viventes ſecundùm equitatem et juſtitiam, quamcunque religionem profeſſi fuerint, ſervatos

[e] This quoted Art. XIII. Sect. VI.

[f] De prophetico Jeſu Chriſti munere; or page 212.

[g] Mentioned Art. X. Sect. II. Ep. ad Jo. Ulatt, in Cic. Tuſc. Diſp.

[h] Art. XIII. Sect. V.

[i] To what was quoted Art. XIII. Sect. V. from *Hume's* Hiſtory, ſhould be added the latter part of Hume's ſentence; which belongs to the 18th Article: "Any one who preſumes to maintain, that an Heathen can poſſibly be ſaved, is himſelf expoſed to the penalty of eternal perdition."—Hume's Hiſt. 4to. Vol. 3, page 334, 1ſt Edit. quoted by Gilpin in his Life of Cranmer, page 159.

[k] Sect. 16. De Eccleſiâ.

ſervatos iri." The Scotch might be the more zealous, as being inclined to *Calviniſm:* to ſuch it muſt be ſhocking to have any one ſpeak as if there were no *elect*.

The authors of the *Reformatio Legum* are alſo very warm; perhaps thinking the notion oppoſed an affront to Chriſtianity. "*Horribilis*[1] eſt et inanis illorum audacia, qui contendunt in omni religione vel ſectâ quam homines profeſſi fuèrint ſalutem illis eſſe ſperandam," &c.—In the ſame chapter is a declaration againſt the notion that *all* men ſhall be ſaved *at laſt*, after undergoing ſome puniſhment; which notion is the ſubject of the laſt of King Edward's Articles. Perhaps it might ſeem, that univerſal ſalvation, though after ſome evil ſuffered, was not agreeable to the ſcriptural accounts of ſalvation by Chriſt.

This Reformatio Legum profeſſes to cenſure only hæreſies actually prevailing at that time: as appears from the Epilogus after the twenty-ſecond chapter.

VI. We have ſometimes carried our hiſtorical remarks lower than the times when the Articles were compiled; if we do this in the preſent caſe, we may take notice of *Milton*, *Hobbes*, and *Pope*.

Milton may not at firſt, ſeem a proper inſtance, as he did not, in the latter part of his life, adhere to *any* ſect, but thought he might be ſaved though ſeparate from all ſects; but if the fault condemned in the Article be that of not founding our hopes of Salvation on our being members of the *Church* of Chriſt, and on our acting as ſuch; the great Poet might run into that fault by depriving himſelf of opportunities of performing *ſocial acts* of Chriſtian worſhip. His Biographer, Dr. Johnſon, ſeems to diſapprove of his conduct in this reſpect.

Hobbes

[1] De Hæreſibus, Cap. 11.

Hobbes is mentioned by Biſhop Burnet as requiring no man to take farther care what Religion he is of, than that it be the religion eſtabliſhed in his own country by *law*. —I would mention Mr. *Pope* only in order to introduce thoſe two lines of his, which may have contributed, perhaps more than he intended, to promote the notion condemned in our Article;

> For modes of Faith let graceleſs Zealots fight,
> His can't be wrong whoſe Life is in the right.
> Near end of 3d Ep.—Eſſay on Man.

We might again[m] read the paſſage where Dr. Prieſtley affirms, that "nothing is requiſite to make men" object of God's favour, "but ſuch moral conduct as he has made them capable of;" —with what follows.

VII. After Hiſtory we come to *Explanation*.

Ought this eighteenth to be conſidered as belonging to the *ſecond*[n] or *third part* of our thirty-nine Articles? I think, rather to the *third*; it ſeems a kind of *Introduction*; and the idea this; a man muſt not think that he may be ſure of Salvation as a member of *any* ſect, or religious *Society*, which he may happen to engage in: Salvation can only be hoped for, according to the *Scriptures*, from being a member of the *true Church* of *Chriſt*, whatever may be the right idea of that Church: and what it *is*, is ſettled in the ſubſequent Articles.—The *Scotch* confeſſion introduces the error oppoſed in our eighteenth Article, under the ſubject *Eccleſia*.

In

[m] Near the end of Art. XII; from Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 1, page 279, end of Atonement.

[n] Theſe *Parts* ſee opening of Introduction to ſecond Part: before Art. IX. and opening of this 18th Article.

In the Articles of 1552, indeed, there is an Article *between*° our eighteenth and nineteenth, againſt evading the *Moral Law*, either under pretence of its being *Moſaical*, or of immediate *inſpiration*; and ſo the connexion might be, though mere virtue cannot *ſave* men, it is not to be *neglected*:—in 1562, the part about the moral law of Moſes was added to the *ſeventh* Article, (about the Old Teſtament) and the part about Inſpiration was omitted.

The *title* of our eighteenth Article ſpeaks of obtaining Salvation "by the *Name* of Chriſt:" in compliance with the text which is introduced into the Article. The force of that expreſſion may therefore be noticed when we come to that text.

VIII. "*They* ALSO *are to be had* ACCURSED," —to what does the word "*alſo*" refer? no perſons had been pronounced accurſed before?—but ſeveral ſets of perſons had been *condemned* for holding different errors, though not by the ſame expreſſion. In the fourteenth Article we have, "Works of *ſupererogation* cannot be taught without *arrogance* and *impiety*;"—In the ſixteenth, "they are to be *condemned* which ſay they can no more ſin," &c.—In the ſeventeenth, a doctrine is ſaid to ſet men on a *precipice* from which they are liable to fall headlong into deſpair, or licentiouſneſs:—in the eighteenth, "they *alſo* are to be had *accurſed*," &c. "damnandi"—*et*— "anathematizandi."

Indeed it might be proper to take notice of the meaning of the word "*they*:" the perſons ſpoken of muſt be ſuppoſed, at leaſt, to *know* of Chriſtianity, if not to be, in ſome ſenſe, *Chriſtians*: in 1552

° Why ſhould Biſhop Sparrow, in his Articles of 1562, inſert this Article of 1552 *before* our 18th? was he unwilling to interrupt the ſeries of Articles relating to the *Church*?

1552 the title was, "*We* muſt truſt to obtain eternal ſalvation only by the name of Chriſt:" and in the body of the Article we have, "holy *Scripture* doth ſet out unto *us* only the name of Jeſus Chriſt whereby men muſt be ſaved." This cannot belong to thoſe who know nothing of the Holy Scriptures[p]: the perſons condemned are ſuppoſed to make a wrong choice, to reſt their hopes of happineſs on a wrong foundation, when they *might* reſt them upon a right one.

If it be ſaid, that "*ſect*," and natural *virtue*, conſidered in regard to a power of conferring ſalvation, are oppoſed to *Chriſt*, and therefore *ſect* may mean a religion *not* Chriſtian; I anſwer, there may be ſects not Chriſtian, which may be within *reach* of arguments for Chriſtianity, though too careleſs in attending to ſuch arguments: and there may be *Chriſtian* ſects too careleſs about approaching as near to the *Truth* as poſſible. (Art. XIII. Sect. 1. near the end.) —Probably at the *Reformation* many took up this mode of talking; it ſignifies but little whether you are Papiſt or Proteſtant, or Puritan, or even a Jew, if you are a good *man*.— And many might float about, as kind of nominal Chriſtians, without paying much attention to *any* reaſonings on religious ſubjects.—This might retard the Reformation, as well as ſeem an affront to Chriſtianity. One cannot conceive a perſon to be ſtrongly impreſſed with the idea, that he can only be ſaved by being a member of the Church of Chriſt; and not anxious to know wherein genuine Chriſtianity conſiſts.

"*To be had accurſed*," in the Latin, "*anathematizandi ſunt*;"—are to be anathematized. Something was ſaid of the meaning of this expreſſion, in

[p] See opening to the thirteenth Article.

in the third Book[q]. It has an harſh ſound, but ſhould be, like all other expreſſions, interpreted by *cuſtom*. Now it has been very much the cuſtom to condemn errors in ſuch form as this; if any one holds ſuch an error, "*anathema ſit*," let him be accurſed: we may ſee inſtances in the acts of the Council of *Trent*, or of any other Council. —And in our readings on Biſhop *Pearſon*, we meet with[r] *Cyrill's* twelve anathematiſms, againſt Neſtorius, and thoſe of the Council of Sirmium and others, againſt[s] *Photinus*. Indeed this has been the *eſtabliſhed* language of the Church. Its general meaning ſeems to have been, that men who ran into ſuch particular errors, did not deſerve to be united to the holy Church of Chriſt, did not appear to be ſo in the ſight of God;—but ought to be looked upon as *ſeparated* from it: and as anathemas accompanied *excommunications*, the ideas of them became[t] *aſſociated*. This account agrees with the expreſſions in Bingham's Antiquities; where the expreſſion, "caſt out of the Church," uſed by Pope Vigilius, ſeems equivalent to, "*anathema eſto*," uſed by the firſt Council of Bracara.—And in *Wall's*[u] tranſlations from Auguſtin, we find *renounced* and *anathematized* put as meaning the ſame thing.—This anathematizing was not only the language of the high *Orthodox* party, but of *Pelagius* himſelf[x].—It was indeed taken from the New Teſtament, which often took its expreſſions from the Old. Conſult Rom. ix. 3.—1 Cor. xvi. 22.—Gal.

[q] Chap. ix. Sect. 1. Vol. 2, page 97.

[r] Page 325, Fol. [s] Page 120, Fol.

[t] See Du Freſne under *Excommunicatio*. The *excommunicatio major* and Anathema are ſaid, I think, to mean the ſame thing.

[u] On Infant Baptiſm, page 188, 4to. or 1. 16. 24.

[x] See his Creed, in Auguſtin's Works, Vol. 10. Pref. Edit. Antv.—Voſſius's Hiſt. Pel. l. 1.—Wall 1. 19. 29.

Gal. i. 8.—Rev. xxii. 3.—In Rom. ix. 3. *accurſed* anſwers to the marginal *ſeparated*; αναθεμα is from ανατιθημι to ſeparate. Αναθεμα amongſt the *Heathens* ſignified anything put aſide, or ſeparated for the uſe of the Gods; that is in effect, moſt commonly, for *deſtruction*. *Sacer*, means, ſet apart, or *devoted*, in the ſenſe of *curſed*. In 1 Cor. xvi. 22. St. Paul uſes both the term of the LXX, αναθεμα, and the Hebrew *maran-atha*[y], *curſed art thou*; changing, according to cuſtom, the final *m* of מחרם into *n*.—In Gal. i. 8. αναθεμα ſeems to imply ſeparation, devoting, curſe.—It is on Rev. xxii. 3. that *Hammond* gives his explanation of αναθεμα, and makes it relate to *excommunication*.

In the *Old Teſtament*, חרם generally, if not always, implies ſeparation for the purpoſe of deſtruction. And with us, *devoted*, conveys the ſame idea: yet *Corban* amongſt the Jews, *oblation*, from קרב to approach, implied ſomething conſecrated and *not* to be deſtroyed; but when anything was devoted to deſtruction, there was a previous ſeparation of it, either actual, or ſuppoſed. The Heathen[z] Idols were actually ſet apart and devoted;—the city[a] of Jericho, when devoted to the Lord, or accurſed, is *ſuppoſed* to be ſet apart; the beſiegers are commanded to "*keep*" *themſelves* "from the accurſed thing."—*Chriſt*, by an ignominious death, was "made a curſe[b] for us," was devoted to deſtruction: "*curſe*" often means a devoted[c] *perſon*.

From hence we may conceive how the early Chriſtians might come to uſe the word *curſe*, or *anathema*,

[y] Parkhurſt's Lexicon: this is Parkhurſt's etymology, but not the common one.

[z] Deut. vii. 25, 26. [a] Joſhua vi. 17, 18.

[b] Gal. iii. 13.—Deut. xxi. 23.

[c] See Hammond on Rev. xxii. 3.

anathema, and how they might eſteem any cooler word, a ſign of lukewarmneſs or diſrepect.—Though we ſhould not omit to mention the *example* which they had in Deut. xxvii. 14—26.

The expreſſion of the Article in 1552 was, "They alſo are to be had accurſed *and abhorred*," &c. which looks more like the "*damnandi*" of the ſixteenth Article, than "*accurſed*" alone.

IX. "*That preſume to ſay that every man ſhall be ſaved*"—what is here blamed, may not perhaps appear, without ſome attention: the words may lead ſome to think, that it is called an accurſed thing to *hope* that virtuous Heathens *may* be ſaved: but they do really expreſs a different idea; they do not blame candor, but *preſumption*; it would be preſumption to *acquit* a culprit, or reus, without authority, as well as to *condemn* one; we need not condemn, but we muſt not acquit: to do either properly, we ſhould be *judges*. It is neither our buſineſs to *confine* the mercy of God in its operations, nor to *diſpenſe* it according to our fancies.—

Nay, ſuppoſe that in particular caſes it were allowed us ſtrongly to hope, that the divine goodneſs would be exerted, yet even that falls far ſhort of the preſumption of affirming that "*every* man ſhall be" made eternally happy in a way preſcribed by ourſelves.

X. "*By the Law or Sect which he profeſſeth*," &c. Biſhop *Burnet* diſtinguiſhes between being ſaved *by* a law, and *in* a law;—and with reaſon; a man may be ſaved *in* an imperfect religion *by* the mercy of God, or even by the merits of *Chriſt*; though not by virtue of the religion which he profeſſes: it may be conſidered whether the word *whereby*, which comes afterwards, does not rather confirm this notion.—Indeed in the *Latin* Article the expreſſion is "*in* lege," but we cannot ſay that the

the Engliſh is a wrong tranſlation; becauſe the Engliſh and Latin are equally authentic. "In ſectâ" therefore means, as a *member* of a ſect.—We have[d], in Eph. iv. 32. εν Χριϛῳ tranſlated, "for Chriſt's ſake;" it may mean, as a *member* of Chriſt; or of that *ſociety*, or *body* of which he is the Head. It is ſcarcely needful to obſerve, that our being ſaved *by Chriſt*, or *in* Chriſt, cannot exclude[e] *human agency*. (εν ᾧ is tranſlated *whereby*.)

XI. "*Only the Name*," &c.—In order to ſee the force of this expreſſion, which is taken from Acts iv. 12. we muſt conceive different men to worſhip[f] different deities, and *invoke* them and praiſe[g] them, and *ſwear*[h] by them under their different *names*.—The contention between Elijah and the Prieſts of *Baal*, related in 1 Kings, Chap xviii, may give us an idea of the caſe; particularly ver. 24. & 26.—Through aſſociation and habit, ſentiment and paſſion are excited by the mere ſound of a name; ſo that enthuſiaſm might rage on ſounding the name of a much-honoured Deity, and the whole of his attributes might ſeem to be concentred in the appellation. We find ſimilar effects from the names of political or other parties[i]; the very ſound of them excites animoſity and virulence[k].

And when men do not diſtinguiſh between the power of the perſon to whom the name belongs, and

[d] Art. xii. end of Sect. xi.
[e] Art. x. Sect. xxxii.
[f] Joſhua xxiv. 15.
[g] Pſalm lxviii. 4.
[h] Pſalm lxiii. 12.—1 Sam. xvii. 43.
[i] The Chorus in the Oratorio of Samſon, in which the Iſraelites and the Philiſtines contend in Invocation, the one party invoking *Jehovah*, the other *Dagon*, muſt tend to enliven our conceptions of what is related, 1 Kings xviii. 24, &c.
[k] Nov. 1793, the French are changing names of Streets, Cards, Months, &c.

and the combination of letters or ſounds which compoſe the name, then the name itſelf comes to be regarded as endued with ſome *charm* or ſupernatural influence.

XII. The laſt thing which can come into our explanation, is the word "*ſaved*," and we have *before*[l] conſidered its meaning. Here we may obſerve, that Salvation (and in like manner damnation) may admit of an endleſs variety of *degrees:* and it might be wrong to omit wholly, that *ſaving* has in Acts iv. 12. a particular reference to deliverance from *bodily* evil. Peter and John had healed a lame man; they are aſked ſolemnly, "By what power, or by what *name* have ye done this?" they anſwer, "By the name of Jeſus Chriſt of Nazareth."— "Neither is there *ſalvation* in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby (εν ᾧ) we muſt be ſaved;" (δεῖ σωθηναι ἡμας). Suppoſe this meant merely that the lame could only be healed in the name of Chriſt, yet the healing meant was miraculous; and therefore that would be ſaying, that real miracles could only be performed in ſupport of Chriſtianity: but the Apoſtle, with what he ſays about the miraculous cure, mixes a great deal of reaſoning about the nature of the Chriſtian Diſpenſation, and we[m] know that mere admiſſion into Chriſtianity, was called being *ſaved:* what he ſays, ver. 12. ſeems to be delivered as an *univerſal* truth.

XIII. Having finiſhed our explanation, we come to the *Proof* of what is affirmed in our Article. And I do not ſee that we need make more than *one propoſition*.

XIV. 'The

[l] Appendix to Art. XI. Sect. XVII.—and ſeveral other places.

[m] Art. IX. Sect. XIV. and Appendix to Art. XI. Sect. XVIII.

XIV. 'The Scriptures do not allow any one to conſider it as an indifferent matter, whether he acts as a member of the true Church of Chriſt, or not.'

We have already produced many texts which are really to this purpoſe[n], though they relate immediately to acts of *individuals*. There would be no propriety in our being repreſented as branches of a *vine*, as the *flock* of a ſhepherd, as the *ſpouſe* of Chriſt, as *elect*, *knit* together, forming an *edifice* built upon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Jeſus Chriſt himſelf being the chief corner-ſtone, if we were under no *obligation* to act ſocially as Chriſtians, or if we could attain to Chriſtian *Salvation* without acting ſo.

XV. As to *indirect* proof, or anſwers to *objections*, we have before given what is abundantly ſufficient. No objections of any force ſeem to occur, except thoſe from Acts x. 34 and Rom. ii. 14—27.; and theſe[o] texts have been already conſidered.

XVI. We may therefore proceed to our *Application*.

We might, at this time, give our *Aſſent* to the Article before us in ſome ſuch form as the following;

'Whatever degree of happineſs it may pleaſe God, in his mercy, to confer on the virtuous *Heathen* or *Jew*, who continues ſuch to the end of his life without any *fault* of his own; no man can *voluntarily neglect* the proviſion which God has made for us under Chriſtianity, or encourage others to neglect it, or be *careleſs* about getting as near *truth*

[n] Art. XII. Sect. XXI.—Art. XIII. near the end of Sect. XVII. and near the end of Sect. XXII.

[o] Art. XIII. Sections XXIII. & XXVI.

truth and perfection as poſſible[p], in Chriſtianity, without meriting a ſevere *condemnation*, and rendering himſelf *unworthy* to continue in poſſeſſion of the ineſtimable privileges of that ſociety of which Chriſt in Heaven is the Head, and to[q] purchaſe which he ſhed his precious blood.'

XVII. With regard to *mutual conceſſions*, little more ſeems wanting than for diſputants to acknowledge that, when they diſagree, they do not ſufficiently conſider the different *points of view* in which they ſee the ſubject of contention.—When we approve ſuch expreſſions as that of Mr. *Pope*[r], we ſuppoſe men to have done their beſt, humanly ſpeaking, to acquire right religious principles: when we diſapprove men's notions, and call them horrible, blaſphemous, *accurſed*, &c. we ſuppoſe men not doing their beſt; but neglecting, with abſurd preſumption, contemptuous ingratitude, and profligate inſenſibility, every thing that has been done and ſuffered for mankind, in order to give them a bleſſed religion, and bring them to the never-ending enjoyment of ſupreme felicity.—While men diſpute without entering into each other's views, they are not likely to come to any end of diſputing; but there are perſons ſo reaſonable as to allow of candour towards thoſe who really do every thing in their power to be upon a right footing in reſpect of religion, and at the ſame time to abhor, eſpecially in themſelves, every degree of voluntary negligence.—Not to act as Chriſtians, may in ſome be only a misfortune, in others a great fault; but yet in either caſe it may be attended with great and important[s] *evil*.

XVIII. I am

[p] Phil. i. 9.—iii. 13, 14 —Concluſion of St. Peter's ſecond Epiſtle.

[q] Acts xx. 28.

[r] Sect. VI.

[s] Dr. Balguy's Sermons, page 158, &c. to the end of the 9th Diſcourſe.

XVIII. I am not prepared to ſuggeſt any *Improvement* relative to the preſent Article; unleſs it might be *expreſſed* more preciſely than it is. Perhaps it might be ſo expreſſed as to ſhew *for whom* it is particularly intended, how far it conceives thoſe of whom it ſpeaks, to be members of religious *Society*; and how it ſuppoſes thoſe whom it condemns, to be informed of the nature of Chriſtianity.

ARTICLE XIX.

OF THE CHURCH.

THE viſible Church of Chriſt is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly miniſtered, according to Chriſt's ordinance, in all thoſe things that of neceſſity are requiſite to the ſame.

As the Church of Hieruſalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred; ſo alſo the Church of Rome hath erred; not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but alſo in matters of Faith.

---

1. Before I enter upon another Article, let me ſay, that it is my intention, in this part of my undertaking, to make a change in my manner of treating the ſubjects which may come under conſideration. I mean to treat the remaining articles in a more *ſummary* way than I have treated the preceding. For this change it may be natural to aſk ſome reaſons. The firſt is, that without ſome change, our ſyſtem would be *too extenſive*, if it be not ſo already, conſidering that, in order to obey the directions of our Founder, I have been obliged to make Biſhop *Pearſon* on the Creed occupy every third Lecture. It may indeed be ſaid, that if I had treated the preceding Articles more briefly, I might have treated the following more fully; and without taking more time: that is true; but yet

yet it ſeems better to go the bottom of ſome ſubjects, and give a ſummary account of others, than to treat all with an intermediate degree of fulneſs. This might be ſaid though there were no other reaſons for the change I am about to make; but it may be added, that the remaining ſubjects have been already much better treated than thoſe which we have gone through; and are therefore much more eaſy for the ſtudent to conſider by himſelf. Biſhop *Burnet* writes better on the Articles which are to come, than on thoſe which are paſt: and the refutation of the *Popiſh* errors is now reduced into a ſmall compaſs, by Archbiſhop *Secker* and Biſhop *Porteus*. It ſeems to me likewiſe, that the firſt eighteen of our XXXIX Articles may be conſidered as more important than the reſt, as belonging more to Mankind in general. Religious Society is indeed a ſubject of great importance to all men; but that was attentively conſidered in the third Book of our Syſtem.

Nevertheleſs, though I propoſe to ſpeak more briefly on each ſubject than I have done hitherto, or at leaſt than I have done ſince I entered upon the Articles of our Church, I would keep the ſame method in view; as that ſeems founded in reaſon. What facts are mentioned, ſhould be mentioned before we uſe the expreſſions which allude to them: and the terms of propoſitions ſhould be explained before their truth be proved.

11. With regard then to the nineteenth Article, ſome few *Hiſtorical* remarks may be made. The propagation of the Goſpel was treated in our firſt Book. Here we may obſerve, that before[a] the Church

[a] The Hiſtory of the beginnings of the Church of Rome is, I believe, too obſcure for *us* to dwell much upon: I would not ſpeak poſitively: the Biſhop of Rome muſt be above *neighbouring*

Church of *Rome* came to be famous in the weſt, the Churches mentioned in the Article, had exiſted in great celebrity: ſo I conceive. The Church of *Jeruſalem* muſt of courſe be eminent, as it was planted where our Saviour and his Apoſtles reſided: it might be conſidered as the *ſource* of Chriſtianity, where it was moſt pure: the firſt Biſhop of it is ſaid to have been St. *James*.

The Church of *Alexandria* was the capital of the Churches of *Africa*, and has been ſaid to be founded by St. *Mark*. In like manner the Church of *Antioch* was the capital of the Churches of *Aſia*, and has been ſaid to have had St. *Peter* for its firſt Biſhop. Theſe became three *Patriarchates*, and we have in *Bingham's* Antiquities[b], three *maps* of them[c].

In *what* theſe three churches "have erred," ſeems but of little moment; becauſe the Article is only againſt the *Romaniſts*, and they would not deny the fallibility of the Eaſtern Churches. Yet theſe three churches might have made as high claims, of any kind, as the Church of Rome; having under them Primates and Metropolitans. The

ing Biſhops; people would have to go to Rome about various concerns; when a precedence was wanted, it would naturally fall to the Biſhop of that Church which was in the Capital.—By the year 325 the Biſhop of Rome muſt have grown great: about the year 250 there were at Rome 1500 Widows and other indigent perſons ſupported or relieved by Chriſtians; ſee Lardner, Index, *Rome*.—The Biſhop of Rome was not at Nice in 325, only *Preſbyters*; why not Suffragan Biſhops, if he had any?

[b] Book ix.

[c] For the dignity of theſe Churches ſee the Canons of the Council of Nice; Canon 6 and 7.—Alſo Biſhop Halliſax on Prophecy, page 335.—Heylin, on Epiſcopacy, mentions Saint James, Saint Mark and Saint Peter as having been the firſt Biſhops.

—The errors alluded to, however, ſeem to have been, favouring *Arianiſm*, and condemning[d] *Origen*. Acts for theſe purpoſes were paſſed in Councils[e] at theſe cities; and the decree of a *Council* at any city muſt include the opinion of the *Church* there.—(Councils occur again in the twenty-firſt Article.)

Several *ſubjects* relative to our preſent Article, have been much diſcuſſed; but it does not ſeem neceſſary for us to enter into them at preſent; ſuch are, the *marks* of a[f] true Church, the power of the *Keys*[g], the nature of *binding*[h] and *looſing*.—The Romaniſts, after we had ſeparated from them at the Reformation, held, that we were no true church; and the diſputes which took place on that matter, were probably one immediate *occaſion*[i] of our preſent Article.

III. Let us next ſee what may be wanted in the way of *Explanation*.—Our Article conſiſts of two Paragraphs; the firſt ſeems to be definition and theory, the ſecond, fact.

IV. The definition is, of "*the viſible church of Chriſt*:" now previous to that, we ſhould conceive, that Chriſt formed all his Diſciples into *one ſociety*; the members therefore muſt live in different *ages*: it is not needful to conſider the deceaſed at preſent, therefore our views are confined to the "viſible church," that is, to the ſociety of all *living* Chriſtians. But how, you ſay, do theſe form a *ſociety?* firſt, we may anſwer, as all *men* form a ſociety; God has made *good* to follow

[d] Socrates 6. 10.
[e] Berti's Compendium, Vol. 1, page 126.
[f] Hales, G—13—49, Cambr. [g] Matt. xvi. 18, 19.
[h] Matt. xviii. 18.
[i] The Trent Creed is called by the Romaniſts, that Faith "extra quam nemo ſalvus eſſe poteſt." quoted in Bennet's Eſſay on the 39 Articles, page 426.

follow from mens acting as a ſociety, and *evil* from their *not* acting as a ſociety; this ſhews them that they *are* a ſociety. Secondly, we know, that all Chriſtians conſtitute one ſociety, from the *Scriptures*[k].

V. "*Congregation*," cœtus, rather ſeems to imply, as does εκκλησια, that all living Chriſtians can aſſemble at one time, in one place; this is ſuitable enough to *Theory*, and is Dr. *Balguy's*[l] firſt ſuppoſition, when he is deſcribing the nature of a Church: the contrivances which become neceſſary when it is found that all cannot make one congregation, are only *mechanical*, as it were, and do not affect the nature or eſſence of the thing which accidentally requires them.

The compilers of our Article would be led to uſe the word "*congregation*" by the language of our Old Teſtament; the *whole body* of Iſraelites, (the *Church* of God before Chriſtianity) being called the Congregation. See Numb. xvi. 3.—xxvii. 17.—Joſh. xxii. 17.—1 Chron. xxviii. 8.—Pſalm lxxiv. 2. in all which places we have συναγωγη in the LXX; except 1 Chron. xxviii. 8. which is Εκκλησια.—In the *New* Teſtament the whole Body of Chriſtians is called the *Church* of God; but the Greek is always Εκκλησια: *Taylor* however looks upon this calling the whole body of Chriſtians the *Church*, as an *imitation* of the language of the Old Teſtament, in which the whole Body of Iſraelites was called the *Congregation*.—Taylor on Romans, Key, par. 52. 133.

VI. The word "*faithful*" ſeems technical; *fideles* uſed to be oppoſed to *Catechumeni*.

VII. "The

[k] Art. XVIII. Sect. XIV.—Alſo Book III. Chap. XI. Sect. IV.

[l] Vol. of Sermons, page 89.

VII. "The *pure* word of God"—is alſo *theory*: it is that to which Chriſtians may continually approach, though they may never attain to perfect purity of doctrine.—"*The ſacraments*" are introduced as *eſſentials* of a Chriſtian Church; and it is at the ſame time implied, that though they are eſſential, ſome *circumſtances* about them are not ſo: this is more clear in the Latin than in the Engliſh. —A religious ſociety under natural religion might perhaps have no eſſentials; I mean, they might purſue the ends in view by ſuch methods as their wiſdom ſhould ſuggeſt; but that is not the caſe in a Chriſtian ſociety; they cannot teach any doctrines but thoſe of ſcripture, nor ſet aſide the holy *Sacraments*.—We may obſerve how very little was thought[m] neceſſary, by our Engliſh Reformers, to conſtitute a Chriſtian Church; prayer is not mentioned, though it is in Acts ii. 41, 42. nor any kind of diſcipline: this ſeems to imply, that no Chriſtian church could be ſuppoſed to meet without prayer, or that prayer is included in pure *doctrine*, and that no modes of adminiſtering the Sacraments deſtroy the *eſſence* of a Chriſtian Church.

VIII. In the ſecond part there is a ſort of ambiguity: a doubt is left, whether the three churches only erred in *general*, or erred, like the church of Rome, in morality, (agenda), ceremonies, and tenets (credenda): but either ſenſe may be taken by him who gives his aſſent.

In

[m] P. S. See a paſſage quoted by Dean Tucker (Letter to Kippis, page 56) from the enlarged confeſſion of Augſburg. "Ad veram unitatem Eccleſiæ ſatis eſt conſentire de *Doctrinâ* Evangelii, et adminiſtratione Sacramentorum." This does not mean a conſent about all *particulars*, as appears from what follows, which anſwers to the beginning of our 34th Article: "Nec neceſſe eſt ubique ſimiles eſſe Traditiones humanas, ſeu *ritus* ab hominibus inſtitutos." Syntagma, page 12.

In the Engliſh, we have "*in their living*," (Church of Rome), but in the Latin, "quoad *agenda*." The Engliſh ſeems to regard *conduct*, the Latin, moral, practical *principles taught*, or allowed. Hence, in examining the wickedneſs prevailing in Popiſh countries, we ſhould always keep in mind how far it is permitted, or encouraged.

The Church of *Rome* is here allowed the *eſſence* of a true Church[n]; it aims at preaching ſcriptural doctrines, and it does not ſet aſide the Sacraments. Archbiſhop *Laud*, on his *trial*[o] before the inveterate enemies of the Roman church, maintained this to be the truth, but did not, I think, refer to this Article, to prove it: that the Church of Rome is here declared *erroneous*, as well as fallible, needs no remark. The Church of Chriſt in *theory* is *pure*; in *practice* each part of it is *fallible* and imperfect.

IX. Thus we have looked through the Article; but yet a few things remain to be mentioned: if "the viſible Church of Chriſt" be the ſociety of *living* Chriſtians, what is *oppoſed* to it? or what Church of Chriſt is *inviſible?* the Romaniſts do not allow[p] of *any*. There may be, ſeemingly, *two* notions of

[n] The Puritans did not allow this.—See Neal, 1. 96. 4to.

[o] Index to Neal's Hiſt. Pur. et alibi. When Proteſtants ſay, that a Chriſtian may be ſaved in the Church of Rome, they mean, or ought to mean, ſuppoſing the Chriſtian not to think it *wrong* to be of that Church.—Therefore Papiſts cannot uſe their famous argument to thoſe who do think it wrong.—The argument is, all ſides own, that a man may be ſaved in the Church of Rome; but all ſides do *not* own that a man may be ſaved in a Proteſtant Church; therefore it is moſt *ſafe* to adhere to the Church of Rome.

[p] "The pretenſed inviſible Church of the Heretikes."—Rhemiſts on Acts ii. 47. the Romaniſts ſeem to *mean*, that the ſcriptures, when they ſpeak of the *Church* of Chriſt, do not mean to ſpeak of thoſe who are true Chriſtians in the ſight of God, but of Chriſtians ſuch as we find them.

of it; one, that the *inviſible* church contains *all Chriſtians*; the living, and all who have departed this Life in the Faith of Chriſt: another, the calviniſtic, and moſt common, that it conſiſts of thoſe who *in the ſight of God* are conſidered as true Chriſtians: and Romaniſts, I think, make a difference between *vera* and *viva* membra of the Church. Perhaps the term "*viſible*" might be uſed in order to prevent Romaniſts from objecting; and to ſatisfy *Calviniſts* that it was not intended to ſpeak here of the *elect* or *predeſtinate*, as ſeen by God himſelf.

x. We often hear of the *Catholic* Church.—If we go only by Etymology, it may ſignify the whole viſible church of Chriſt, or even inviſible; or all Chriſtians of all ages. When I ſay I *believe* in the Catholic Church, I mean, I believe that Chriſt intended to form all Chriſtians into one ſociety; though when I ſpeak of the Church at large, I have only in mind the preſent generation. (Art. VIII. Sect. III.)—And the church of Chriſt may be "therefore called catholic, or univerſal, becauſe it conſiſts of *all nations*; whereas the Jewiſh Church" conſiſted[q] "only of one nation:"—As words are made for uſe, one may often get the right *ſenſe* of a word by conſidering for what *uſe* it might be made; and this is generally to mark out ſome *diſtinction*; as juſt now was the the caſe. *The* church might be called *Catholic*, to diſtinguiſh it from *a* church, or a *particular* church; that is a ſet of Chriſtians whoſe minds cannot be ſatisfied without joining in ſome peculiar regulations for carrying on ſocial religion amongſt themſelves, within certain limits. But perhaps the moſt common uſe of catholic is to diſtinguiſh, in an honourable manner, a *large* and reſpectable body of Chriſtians

[q] Biſhop Porteus's brief confutation, page 14.

Chriſtians from a ſmall body who affect ſingularity in ſome doctrine or ceremony: to call the large body the catholic church, or catholics, ſeems to make the ſmall one ſink into nothing; as if it only made an exception not worth mentioning.

XI. A *particular church* may be a legitimate Chriſtian Society, but ſhould always regard itſelf as a conſtituent part of the catholic church[r]. In any nation, it may help to promote civil ſubjection, and may itſelf receive ſupport and protection or even honour. This has been more fully explained in the third[s] Book.—The definition of our Article ſeems not wholly unſuitable to a particular church[t].

XII. I know not that any other terms need be mentioned except *militant*[u], as oppoſed to triumphant. This diſtinction ſuppoſes men *good*, popularly ſpeaking; then, while they are in this Life warring a good warfare, under the banner of the Captain of their Salvation, while they are fighting the good fight, they are called the church *militant*, and after death, when they[x] receive their crown of Glory, the Church *triumphant*.

The *Scotch* church calls thoſe whom we ſuppoſe good, the *elect*; the church, ſtrictly ſpeaking, (in their

[r] Dr. Powell, page 26, alludes to him, "who refuſed to be made a citizen of Athens, becauſe he was already a citizen of the world."

[s] Chap. XIV.

[t] Wheatly (page 394) obſerves, that our *Church Catechiſm* was ſo made as to ſuit the *Catholic Church*. Any youth in our *particular* Church, according to him, is catechized, or grounded, in no doctrines *peculiar* to that Church. Yet all Chriſtians do not allow of water-baptiſm; nor that the Death of Chriſt is a ſacrifice, ſpeaking without figure.

[u] Scotch Confeſſion, 16. de Eccleſiâ.—Div. Leg. Vol. 4. 8vo. page 470. calls the Church triumphant thoſe who accompany Chriſt at his ſecond coming.

[x] See 2 Tim. iv. 7.—2 Cor. x. 4.—1 Tim. i. 18.—1 Pet. v. 4.

their idea) *inviſible* to the eye of man, but the *true* church in the ſight of God[y].

XIII. We may now beſt ſee the connexion of this Article with the one preceding it. Salvation is not to be hoped for out of the *Church*, by the eighteenth Article; agreed, ſays the Romaniſt, therefore continue *Catholics*; no, ſay the Proteſtants, we may, if we think we cannot lawfully communicate with you, form another *particular* church ſtill conceiving our particular church to make a part of the catholic viſible church of Chriſt: and what we aſſume to ourſelves, we allow to others.

XIV. But let us come to our *Proof*.—We ſeem to have at leaſt *two propoſitions*.

1. Chriſt has formed his followers into one Society.

2. The Romiſh church "hath erred;" in practical principles, or morality, ("agenda"); in ceremonies; and alſo in doctrine or tenets, ("credenda.")

XV. The former propoſition has been very lately[z] *proved*. To what was ſaid we might add 1 Cor. xii. 5. 10. 12. 29. which ſhew, that the miraculous powers given to the Apoſtles, &c. implied religious ſociety: and our Saviour's various *prophecies* concerning the fortunes of the Church, imply the ſame thing. He foretells its durability, &c. as *one* body.—Matt. xvi. 18, 19.

XVI. That the Romiſh Church hath erred in morality, or "agenda," need ſcarcely be proved, not

[y] Pet. Heylin, in his Divinity-Act at Oxford, put up as a queſtion, "An Eccleſia unquam fuerit inviſibilis?" and determined in the negative.—He was an Arminian.

[z] Art. XVIII. Sect. XIV.—See alſo Book III. Chap. XI. Sect. IV.

not only becauſe the Popes and Clergy[a] have had amongſt them men remarkably immoral and profligate; but becauſe things have been *allowed* and *forbidden* wrongly; this, as well as the Popiſh errors in ceremonies and doctrine[b], may be left to be proved by the ſubſequent *Articles*.—Pope *Liberius* favoured the *Arians*[c], *Zozimus* the *Pelagians*, and *Honorius* was condemned as a[d] *Monothelite*.

This direct proof ſeems eaſy, but the Romaniſts quote *ſcripture*; the general anſwer to all texts expreſſing the perfection of the Church, is the ſame with that to all ſcriptural expreſſions of the perfection of a Chriſtian; they deſcribe *theory*[e], not *fact*.—This has been already[f] hinted in explaining the word "*pure*."

XVII. The ſubject before us has been made ſo intricate by controverſy with the Papiſts, and by the Calviniſtic notion, that the Church means the elect and predeſtinated, that it may be worth our while, in the way of *Application*, to conceive a form of *aſſent* to our Article.

'All Chriſtians conſtitute a Society, the end of which is to attain perfect purity of manners, and unerring religious truth: the means of promoting this end are left to human prudence, ſo long as the *doctrines* taught are founded on ſcripture, and the *ſacraments* inſtituted by Chriſt, are held to be indiſpenſible.—Could all Chriſtians agree, they might act

[a] See Sir Edwin Sandys's Europæ Speculum, under *Life and Converſation*: though wickedneſs does not prove indiſputably the inculcating of bad moral principles, yet when it is very prevalent it affords a ſtrong preſumption: beſides that "wickedneſs is deſtructive of good principles;" as *Comber* obſerves, in his tract againſt Popery, page 33, from Ariſtotle, Eth. lib. 6.

[b] Maclaine's Moſheim, Vol. 1. 4to. page 278, Note.

[c] Berti, Vol. 1. page 123.

[d] Forbes, B. 5. Chap. 10.

[e] Art. XV. Sect. XIX.

[f] Sect. VII.

act under one eccleſiaſtical authority; but if any number are fully perſuaded that they cannot lawfully unite with the reſt, they may form a ſeparate ſociety, ſtill conceiving that ſociety to make part of the whole ſociety of Chriſtians, till ſome general agreement can be effected.'

'When we judge from experience, we muſt conclude, that unanimity is not at preſent to be expected; and we muſt allow, that every particular ſociety of Chriſtians falls far ſhort of perfection.'

XVIII. The remarks and diſtinctions here made, might be the ground of ſome mutual *conceſſions*; but Dr. *Du Pin*, in his negociation with Archbiſhop *Wake*[g], about an union between the Engliſh and Gallican Churches, gives up the matter in diſpute. "Though all particular churches," he ſays, "even that of Rome, may err, it is *needleſs* to ſay this in a Confeſſion of Faith."—It is not more to our purpoſe that this learned man gives up the *fallibility* of the Roman Church, than that he ſpeaks of it as a *particular* Church.

XIX. In order to promote *Improvement*, I would recommend an attentive peruſal of Dr. Balguy's two Conſecration-Sermons, and his Charge on "Subſcription to Articles of Religion."

[g] Moſheim, octavo, Vol. 5. page 130.—It might be worth while to read Archbiſhop Wake's compliment to Dr. Du Pin, page 123.—And what the Archbiſhop thinks may be Du Pin's own judgment about the Engliſh Articles.

The *people* amongſt the Papiſts are not taught, I ſuppoſe, according to Du Pin's candid notions; he ſeems to make a great difference between the *People* and the enlightened.

ARTICLE XX.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

THE Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controverſies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written, neither may it ſo expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witneſs and a keeper of holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree any thing againſt the ſame; ſo beſides the ſame ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for neceſſity of ſalvation.

---

1. We begin with *Hiſtory*.

At the time of the Reformation, ſome of our countrymen were deſirous (as we have often occaſion to obſerve) of departing farther from the Church of Rome than we have done, and others wiſhed not to go ſo far. The Reformers had, on this account, a difficult taſk to execute. The Puritans hated the Church of Rome, and every thing that ſeemed to characterize it; but ſome, though they ſaw the errors of Popery, retained their prejudices in favour of thoſe things, which implied no error or impiety. The Reformers wiſhed to comply with both, as far as they might lawfully. The difficulties ariſing in this manner, did

did not relate ſo much to important matters, as to things indifferent in their own nature, as *ceremonies* and *habits*, or what might be called *ceremonies*, in a large ſenſe.

The averſion of the Puritans to appointed ceremonies, &c. ſeems to have been on two grounds; as *Popiſh*, and as profaning worſhip by the introduction of the fine[a] *arts*. Indeed the application of muſic, painting, &c. to religious worſhip, is itſelf rather Popiſh; but independently of that, the Puritans were void of what we call taſte and elegance. The three ceremonies they chiefly objected to, were, the ſign of the *Croſs* in Baptiſm, the wearing of *ſurplices*, and *kneeling* at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Theſe have been called the three[b] *nocent* ceremonies; only by way of oppoſition, I ſuppoſe, to *innocent*. Indeed all theſe ſavoured of Popery; the laſt, as keeping up the idea of the Maſs. But the Puritans always petitioned againſt *Organs*[c], and were enemies, I think, to pictures and images. The rights of Toleration were not allowed till the Revolution[d]; and therefore Puritans, though enemies to the Church of England in many reſpects, were members of it, and Miniſters: they were forced to complain and diſpute; ſeparation was not a thing eaſy to be accompliſhed; otherwiſe diſputes would have been more rare.

One diſpute related immediately to this twentieth Article: the queſtion was, whether the *firſt clauſe*

[a] Book III. Chap. XV. Sect. X.

[b] See John Burges, page 28. mentioned in Hampton Court Conference. Neal. Index.

[c] Convocation of 1562; in Neal, I. 119, &c. Strype, and others.

[d] Book III. Chap. XIV. Sect. XV.

clauſe was genuine or ſurreptitious[e]? It is a curious queſtion: to read Neal's account, one would think it muſt be ſpurious; yet Bennet, in his *Eſſay*, has arguments on the other ſide, which appear to me the ſtronger. In King Edward's articles the clauſe is not; but in the fifth of thoſe articles there is ſomething relating to the ſubject, which is omitted in our ſixth; (the correſponding Article). When the Biſhops in 1562 were to ſign the Articles reviſed, a copy ſeems to have been *prepared* for them to ſign before they met, from King Edward's; but when they met, they ſeem to have made ſeveral alterations in it, and then to have ſigned it. Yet, though they ſigned it, they did not make it a *Record*, becauſe *after* the ſignature, they agreed upon the *clauſe* in queſtion: And as it was not a record, the Archbiſhop kept it in his own private cuſtody, and left it to Benet College.—At laſt a freſh paper was ſigned, which *had* the clauſe in queſtion; and this was lodged regularly, as a *Record*, in the Regiſter's Court of Canterbury, from whence Archbiſhop *Laud* had a copy[f] on his trial, in 1637.

The Biſhops alſo ordered the Articles with the Clauſe to be *printed:* yet there are ſome printed copies which have *not* the clauſe; but Bennet argues, that ſuch are *ſpurious*, if in Engliſh, and that thoſe in which it is found, are genuine: the Records

[e] See Neal, 1. 118. and Bennet's *Eſſay*, paſſim.—Alſo "Prieſtcraft in Perfection," Cambr. Bb—10—47. and Bennet's Anſwer to it in his *Preface* to his Eſſay: addreſſed to Anthony *Collins*, Eſq. the Infidel.

From the Life of Peter *Heylin* it appears, that he kept his act for D. D. at Oxford on the clauſe, taking its genuineneſs for granted.—Strype's Annals, Chap. 28.

[f] *Heylin's ſhort* account (page 19, Life of Laud) agrees, I think, with this.

Records were burnt in the[g] great Fire of London in 1666.—This queſtion is now merely hiſtorical; for by an Act of Parliament made in 1662, all the Clergy are obliged to ſign a copy, in which this clauſe is contained.

The matter about the power of the *Church*, with regard to ceremonies, got mixed with a diſpute how far the *Civil Magiſtrate*[h] could enjoin obſervances for religious ſocieties, in matters indifferent: the Puritans always held, that the Church was *independent* of the ſtate; and few ſaw, that when the Magiſtrate uſed a coercive power in ſpiritual matters he uſed it as the Ally of the Church, as far as he acted without any view of ſecuring the State. However in this twentieth Article we have nothing about the Civil Magiſtrate: nor has the thirty-ſeventh, "Of the Civil Magiſtrates," any mention of rites and ceremonies.

In the time of King Edward VI. there was a great controverſy about the *Habits* of the Prieſts and Biſhops. The Puritans found them Popiſh and fine, others thought them recommendatory of religion; and conſidering the poverty of ſome of the Clergy, almoſt neceſſary for decency. Biſhop *Hooper* had lived at *Zurich*, and perhaps had there contracted a love of plainneſs and ſimplicity; and Swiſs ideas of Church-government. He refuſed the Biſhopric of Glouceſter becauſe he could not be conſecrated and appear at Court, and in his Dioceſe, without wearing ſome habits which he eſteemed to be Popiſh; but his refuſal was not admitted; he was impriſoned ſome months: either in his own Houſe or in the Fleet Priſon, and treated with great rigour; at laſt a compromiſe was

[g] Vol. 2. page 209.—Introd. to Book IV. Sect. IV.
[h] Neal, 1. 95—98. always quarto.

was adopted, and he became a Prelate. He was a perſon of great worth, and very inſtrumental in completing the Reformation.

It is not to be concluded from what has been ſaid, that the Puritans really wiſhed religious ſociety to have little *power*; their view was rather, to prevent thoſe particular ceremonies from being enjoined, which they ſaw the Church of England was, at the time, moſt likely to adopt; and to make *Scripture* a guide in[i] every thing: though, I think, ſcripture was, at bottom, rather a pretext for refuſing, than the ground of making regulations.

The *Romaniſts*, however, were for requiring an implicit obedience to the Church: ſuch an obedience, as if the Church of Rome was in fact, what the Church of Chriſt is in Theory, "without ſpot, or wrinkle, or any[k] ſuch thing." Dr. *Middleton*, in the Preface[l] to his Letter from Rome, gives us a paſſage from a Popiſh writing called "the Catholic Chriſtian," which may anſwer our purpoſe: the ſubject is Tranſubſtantiation. "The unerring authority of the Church has declared it to be true, and enjoined the belief of it;"—after ſuch a deciſion—"it is the part of an Infidel rather than a Chriſtian, to aſk, how can this be?" —The Papiſts have ſaid, that the Church is even ſuperior to[m] Scripture: how?—becauſe the Church judges what *is* ſcripture; there have been many ſpurious writings pretending to be Scripture; theſe the Church rejects, keeping only ſuch as are genuine and authentic: but have they any right to ſettle

[i] Warburton's Alliance, 1. 4. page 46, 8vo. Edit. 1766. Note.

[k] Eph. v. 27. [l] P. lxxvii.

[m] Gilpin's Life of Wickliff, page 61, 62.

ſettle thoſe as ſcripture which are *not* genuine and authentic?—and when they have accepted any thing as ſcripture, does it govern them, or they it?—the moment any writing has an exiſtence as ſcripture, it is ſuperior to them.—Here we cloſe our *Hiſtory*.

11. Our firſt remark in the way of *Explanation*, is, that we ſhould conceive our Article to be divided into *two paragraphs*, the firſt againſt *Puritans*, the ſecond againſt *Papiſts*. Puritans are oppoſed as ſetting aſide all uſe of human prudence in providing the *means* of exerciſing ſocial religion; Papiſts, as aiming to advance human authority above the word of God. In this matter, our Church ſeems to ſay, let us avoid both *extremes*.

"*The Church*,"—how does this expreſſion ſuit what was ſaid under the preceding Article? does it mean *viſible*, *catholic*, *particular*, church? or what?—that is left to be decided by the ſtate of things. If all Chriſtians are united, it means the Catholic church, of one generation; if not, it means any particular church, which can properly be called a church; it means any ſociety of Chriſtians, as far as they conſtitute a legitimate church. —In what part of ſuch ſociety the government ſhould be lodged, whether it ſhould be of a monarchical or democratical form, is left undetermined.

"*Hath power*."—*Power* here means *rightful* power; no uncommon uſe of the word; what is more commonly called *authority*, and perhaps more accurately; for a Tyrant may often have power to do that, which he has no right to do; that is, no authority: but "authority" comes immediately afterwards in another ſenſe.

"*To decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controverſies of faith.*" Here "*authority*" means only *weight* or *influence*; which is not a wrong uſe of the word.—This latter influence, here called authority, is much leſs than the former, here called power. It may be proper for you to reſpect a perſon's judgment, when he has no right to inſiſt on your obedience. The expreſſion, "in *controverſies* of *faith*,"—implies, that you are not expected to give up your judgment to the judgment of the Church, except in doubtful and *difficult* points.

But is the meaning, that your church is to command you with regard to *all* ceremonies whatever?—yes, it ſeems as if private judgment ſhould comply, in matters *indifferent:* and if ſo, you are not accountable while you think it right to continue a member. Reſpectful expoſtulations might be made; and if at laſt, *much* folly or ſuperſtition[n] remained, a ſeparation might be allowed: but the effect of ceremonies depends upon uniformity[o]:—and you ſhould be ſure you can meet with better ceremonies than thoſe you quit. *Ceremonies* might be taken in a *large ſenſe*, including *Liturgies*, &c.—Though the Governors of the church are not to ſubmit to your judgment immediately, yet *after* you have obeyed, they are *finally* to be *accountable* to the ordinary members, for the uſe of any *diſcretionary* power entruſted to them. What follows, limits the power of appointing ceremonies;

"*And yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God's word written;*"—ſome things that next occur in our Article ſeem ſelf-evident; but they probably mean to guard againſt abuſe, and againſt exceſs of that deference, which

[n] See Powell, page 27. top.
[o] Book III. Chap. IV. Sect. II.

which ought to be paid to the Church in difficult doctrines.

Indeed, if each private man is to judge whether an ordinance recommended by the Church is contrary to ſcripture, or whether any doctrine makes one part of ſcripture to contradict another, or is over and above ſcripture, there is but little danger of *abuſe*:—but the meaning ſeems to be, that the Church has no *right*, "*ought*" not to decree ſuch things; though, if it does, it ſhould be reſpected, and perhaps ſometimes obeyed; ſtill the rules here laid down might be the ground of calling eccleſiaſtical governors to account, and, in the end, of propoſing and effecting a Reformation.

"A *keeper* of Holy writ," refers to Rom. iii. 2. and ix. 4.—I conceive them to be alluſions; but the only thing of any moment is, that "*beſides*" the ſcriptures, the Church ought "*not to enforce anything to be believed for neceſſity of Salvation*;" ceremonies are generally ſomething "*beſides*" the ſcriptures, and the church can enforce them; but then they are not "anything to be *believed*."—Some *notions* too may be implied in ceremonies[p], or forms, but then they are not to be enforced as neceſſary[q] to *Salvation*. Puritans would have nothing to be enforced, either to be believed or done, which is "*beſides*" the Scriptures.—It ſhould be recollected, that we had a great deal about Traditions under the ſixth Article.

III. The next thing is the *Proof*.—We might have three propoſitions.

IV. Each

[p] This ſeems the meaning of that part of the 5th Article of 1552, which is omitted in our 6th Article.

[q] *Neceſſary to Salvation*; the thing to which this was oppoſed, ſeems to be, "received of the faithful as godly, and profitable for comelineſs." Article 5 of 1552.

IV. Each ſociety muſt provide *means* of anſwering the ends of its inſtitution.—In religious Society the general end is the promoting of religious *ſentiments*[r]. In *Chriſtian* ſociety ſome means are preſcribed by divine authority; namely, ſcriptural *doctrines* and *ſacraments*: but means are to be deviſed of uſing theſe means; ſomething muſt at laſt be left to the wiſdom of the Church. I cannot but conſider this as ſelf-evident. The puritanical idea, that a church is not like other Societies, or that nothing is to be ſettled and fixed for a church but what is found in Scripture, ſeems totally impracticable; no meeting of Diſſenters[s] could ever be carried on without arranging ſeveral things not ſpecified in Scripture. The directions are *general*, as 1 Cor. xiv. 40.—It is impoſſible that this precept ſhould be obeyed without the intervention of many other obſervances not mentioned. Tell a ſet of men to *write* themes for a prize; there muſt be pens, ink and paper, &c. and the art of writing and ſpelling muſt have been learned. —If the *Jews*[t] had ſome liberty, whoſe religion was confined to one people, and the ceremonials of which made ſo eſſential a part of it, what liberty may not Chriſtians expect, whoſe religion is to be exerciſed amidſt all the variety of cuſtoms of all Nations!

V. In *doctrines*, to be *believed*, the judgment of the Church ought to have great *weight*, eſpecially with all its *ordinary* members.—This was inſiſted on in the ſecond[u] book, where men were divided into *Philoſophers* and *People*: and it ſeems unavoidable.

[r] Book III. Chap. III.

[s] Tucker to Kippis, page 19.

[t] Burnet, Matt. xxiii. 23. the things not to be left undone, were not Moſaical: moſtly, if not all, traditional.

[u] Book II. Chap. IV. Sect. III, IV.

unavoidable. Thoſe who pretend to avoid it, do[x] not, and cannot[y].

VI. In doctrines, if anything is impoſed by the Church as neceſſary to ſalvation, it need not be received as ſuch, if it be not contained in *Scripture*. —This was in the ſixth Article.

VII. What remains muſt be propoſed as *Application*.

A new form of *Aſſent* ſeems unneceſſary:—But mutual *conceſſions* may be worth conſidering.—Some Diſſenters have declared, that whilſt the firſt clauſe of our twentieth Article continues in force, there is no poſſibility of a reconciliation[z]: Yet, let not anything be neglected which ſeems likely to weigh with a man of real *candour*.—Miſtakes ſeem to have been made, both by thoſe in power, and thoſe out of power. The firſt have taken for granted that things indifferent in their nature might be enforced without difficulty; the ſecond, that becauſe an averſion was real, it was rational and invincible.—But in the firſt place men in power ſhould be aware of the ſtrength of prejudice; or of aſſociation of ideas: to ſee its force, we need only aſk any man whether he ſhould chuſe to ſee any of the veſſels which commonly receive the *evacuations* of the human Body, uſed at a feaſt to drink out of; or, if he be a man of piety, in the moſt ſolemn rites of religion? Yet what more indifferent, as to right and wrong, than ſhape?—And in the next place, thoſe who are called to comply and obey, are not always without blame: they are too apt to neglect the reſult

[x] Tucker to Kippis, page 43, 44.

[y] One chief reaſon urged by a Fellow of a College, for turning Papiſt, was, I have heard, that ſo little reſpect was paid to the Church of England by its ordinary members.

[z] Tucker to Kippis, page 9.

reſult of experience with regard to curing prejudices which at firſt feel incurable. To raiſe a prejudice in favour of anything, aſſociate it with ſome good. I have hated a certain kind of *food*; in very great hunger I eat of it; my pain was relieved, and that kind of food got aſſociated in my mind with the pleaſure of the relief; I have reliſhed it ever ſince.—Now mutual conceſſions in caſe of ceremonies, &c. ſhould conſiſt in mutual *compliances*; thoſe who have authority ſhould be tender about enforcing; thoſe who are to obey, ſhould labour to leſſen their averſions; ſo might the contending parties meet in ſome middle point.

This is applicable to *fine arts*: thoſe who have a taſte for them, ought not to act as if all men had the ſame: and thoſe who are inſenſible to them, ought to be aware, that men may differ in imaginations as well as in ſenſes or intellects; and therefore ought in ſome meaſure to comply; for the ſake of others.

Biſhop Warburton, in his Alliance[a] of Church and State, mentions the judgment of foreign divines in the queſtion about *habits*. It was this. "That the Puritans ought to conform, rather than make a ſchiſm: and that the Church-men ought to indulge the others' ſcruples, rather than hazard one."—"A wiſe deciſion," adds Warburton, "and reaching much farther, in religious matters, than to the ſingle caſe to which it was applied." He means, probably, that the principles of mutual conceſſions reſpecting ceremonies, ought to make men candid in matters of faith.

With regard to matters of faith, Dr. *Du Pin*[b] ſays, that the Church certainly has not "the power

[a] Warburton's Alliance, page 314, octavo, B. iii. Chap. 3.
[b] Appendix to Moſheim, as before.

power of ordaining anything that is contrary to the word of God; but he ſays, it muſt be taken for *granted* that the Church *will* never do this in matters, quæ fidei Subſtantiam evertant."

I need not endeavour to ſuggeſt any *Improvement*, after what has been ſaid on the ſubject of improving religious Societies in the laſt chapter of the third Book[c].

[c] Book III. Chap. XV. Sect. XII.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXI.

OF THE AUTHORITY OF GENERAL COUNCILS.

GENERAL Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an Assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture.

---

1. Our *History* here might be very extensive; I will endeavour to confine it within bounds suitable to our present plan, without omitting anything very important.—Nothing is more natural to men, than to consult with each other when they are in difficulties. We are led to consultation both by our reason and our feelings. And we may conceive that, in teaching the Christian Religion, and adapting it to the various customs of different nations, consultation must be frequently desireable. We have a memorable instance in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostle. *Paul* and *Barnabas* were at Antioch; it there appeared, that the Jews who favoured Christianity, or were admitted into it, could not bring themselves to give

give up the religion of *Moſes*; it was divine; they had been brought up in it; it had diſtinguiſhed them from idolatrous heathens; nay, they were not contented with retaining it themſelves, they thought that even the Heathen converts ought to conform to it: Chriſtianity, they ſeem to have thought a new and improved ſpecies of *Judaiſm*. —Now the Apoſtle ſaw, that Chriſtianity was intended to ſuperſede Judaiſm; and that it would be a very great hindrance to the converſion of the Heathens, if they muſt bear the troubleſome burdens of the Law of Moſes, in favour of which they were by no means prejudiced. To manage ſo as to loſe neither Jewiſh nor Gentile converts, required much prudence: it required *conſultation:* Paul and Barnabas thought it worth while to travel from Antioch to Jeruſalem, in order to conſult the "Apoſtles and Elders, with the *whole Church*," in ſo critical a juncture. We have ſome account of the meeting; *James*, the Biſhop[a], ſeems to have given the final determination.—Here was a *genuine* conſultation; the church was not only "aſſembled with one accord," but with one accord they attended to their proper buſineſs: their minds pure from indirect motives; from pride, ambition, rivalſhip, and worldly intereſt. This meeting has frequently been called the firſt *Council*[b].

As Chriſtianity ſpread, any aſſemblies, aiming to collect the ſenſe of Chriſtians *at large*, muſt conſiſt of members convened from a greater extent of country: but *Moſheim* tells us, that till the middle of the ſecond Century[c], *Churches* acted independently of each other, and did not meet together with any ſuch view. He adds, that there was

[a] Art. VI. Sect. XXV.
[b] Held A. D. 47, or near; Cave.
[c] Moſheim, Cent. 2. Part 2. Chap. 2. Sect. 3.

was no *general* council till the fourth century[d]: yet there was a Council held at *Antioch* in the year 270, againſt Paul of Samoſata, where were preſent, according to Cave, Biſhops innumerable.

In proceeding farther, I will firſt mention ſome *facts*, ſuch as a ſcholar is ſuppoſed to be informed of, and then make a few *remarks*. Councils, of one ſort or other, have been very numerous; *Baxter*, in his account, mentions particulars relative to 480.—With regard to the number of *general* councils, writers are not agreed; ſome calling only *ſeven* or *eight* of the Councils general, others *eighteen*.

11. I will now mention ſome of the *principal* councils; that at *Nice*, was held in the year 325, by order of Conſtantine the Great, againſt the *Arians*; and is always called the *firſt* general Council: that at *Conſtantinople* was held in the year 381, by order of Theodoſius the Great, againſt the Macedonians:—the third of thoſe, held at *Epheſus*, was very eminent: it was aſſembled in the year 431, by Theodoſius Junior, againſt *Neſtorius*:—We may add the Council held at *Chalcedon* in the year 451, by order of the Emperor *Marcian*, or, in effect perhaps, by the influence of his Empreſs *Pulcheria*, on account of the adverſary or opponent of Neſtorius, *Eutyches*.—Theſe four are called the *firſt four general Councils*; Gregory the Great compared them to the *four Goſpels*.—The reformed are ſpoken[e] of as having a very high reſpect for them.—I muſt paſs from theſe to ſome of much later date. The Council of *Conſtance*, which began in 1414, was called with the conſent of the[f] See of Rome, and by means of the Emperor Sigiſmund; to decide who ſhould be Pope, and againſt the Reformers,

[d] Cent. 4. 2. 2. 1. [e] Rhemiſh Teſt. on Acts xv. 28.
[f] Baxter, page 430, or Chap. 13.

Reformers, John Wickliffe and John Huſs, and Jerom of Prague. Wickcliffe indeed was dead, but the Council condemned his doctrines, and ordered his bones to be dug up and burnt.—The Council of *Baſil* began in 1431: it ſeems to have been agreed upon at the Council of Conſtance, and to have been aſſembled by the Emperor and Pope jointly, againſt the Reformers; particularly againſt the Bohemians, who had *Ziſca* for their head. But the Council were ſo afraid of their adverſaries as to invite them to defend their notions; a meaſure which had as much ſucceſs as might be expected. —The Council of *Trent* is not mentioned by Baxter or Cave: but we often refer to the Acts of it. From theſe we ſee, that it began Dec. 13, 1545; and from the *Bulla* prefixed, it ſeems as if Pope Paul III. had relied chiefly on the Emperor Charles V. and Francis I. of France. Hiſtory ſays[g], that the Emperor was very deſirous to have the Council continued after the death of Paul III. —The Council was held in order to check the Reformation; its ſuſpenſions and interruptions cannot be entered into here.

Of the Synod of *Dort* I ſaid ſomething in the Hiſtory of the[h] tenth Article.

III. It ſeems as if our ideas of the Councils now mentioned will be very indefinite and imperfect, if we do not mention ſomething of the *numbers* of perſons who have been ſaid to be preſent at each; and the *time* of its continuance. Theſe are by no means agreed upon, but I ſhall ſatisfy myſelf with delivering to you the report of any reſpectable author.—The Council of *Nice* is often called the Council of the 318; that is, of 318 Biſhops;

[g] Moſheim, Cent. 16. Sect. 1. Chap. 4. Sect. 3.
[h] Art. x. Sect. xv.

Biſhops; but Lardner ſhews[i], that this number is not by any means to be depended upon. It probably became the favourite number, becauſe it was the number of *Abraham's*[k] ſervants, by whom he conquered his enemies. But beſides Biſhops we are told, that there were at Nice an incredible number of Preſbyters, &c. At *Conſtantinople* Cave ſays, there were only about 150 Orthodox Biſhops, and 36 of thoſe Biſhops who were followers of Macedonius.—About 200 Biſhops are ſaid to have been at *Epheſus*, and 600 at *Chalcedon*.—For the Council of *Conſtance* I refer to Fox's[l] entertaining account; but the Cardinals and Biſhops were allowed to conſult at their own homes.—Cave does not mention the numbers at *Baſil*[m], nor does Baxter; but there are many hiſtories of that Council: it was a confuſed affair; and the numbers muſt have varied.—At *Trent* the introduction to the Acts of the Council tells us, that there were 5 Cardinals, beſides Legates; 3 Patriarchs, 33 Archbiſhops, 235 Biſhops, 7 Abbots, 7 Generals of Orders, and 146 Divines; and Orators from the Emperor Ferdinand (called Cæſar) ſucceſſor of Charles V. in 1558, and many European Princes:—but at what time theſe were preſent is not ſaid, or whether at any one time.

IV. The *duration* of the above-mentioned Councils was very unequal. The *Nicene* continued only about two months and a few days. That at *Conſtantinople* was interrupted, and held at two different

[i] Works, Vol. 4. page 187. [k] Gen. xiv. 14.

[l] Acts and Monuments, Vol. 1, page 785. quoted alſo by Gilpin in his Lives of Reformers.—*Hume* mentions a larger Council than this, at *Placentia*, A. D. 1096, called by Pope Martin II. in the time of William Rufus, in order to determine upon the firſt Cruſade.

[m] Dupin's Compend. gives a ſhort and intelligible account of this Council.

ferent times[n]. The *Epheſine* ſeems to have continued from about the twentieth of June to the beginning of September.—The Council of *Chalcedon* ſeems to have begun the 15th of October, and to have ended very early in[o] November, if not the laſt day of October.—The Council of *Conſtance* laſted between three and four years[p]; that of *Baſil*[q] eleven, and the Council of *Trent*[r] *eighteen:* reckoning theſe two from the firſt Seſſion to the laſt; taking no notice of ſuſpenſions, interruptions, decrees for removals, &c. &c.

General Councils have been of late *diſcontinued*; probably from their appearing not to anſwer their purpoſe.

v. Their *Authority* has been greatly extolled in words[s], chiefly by the Romaniſts; but when we enter into particular enquiries about them, they ſeem very diſorderly, in fact, whatever they may be in theory; and they ſeem to have been frequently hoſtile to the Papal power, and ſometimes deſtructive[t] of it in particular Popes.—And

[n] The firſt meeting ſeems, from Cave, to have been in May, and to have continued till Auguſt: the next, to have been in the next year, with rather fewer Biſhops.—Dupin's Compend. ſays, we ſhould conceive a third Council to have been held.—Cave's Hiſt. Lit. may eaſily be conſulted on any Councils.

[o] Cave: there are 16 Acts; the firſt on the Ides of October, the 14th Prid. Kal. Nov.—I do not ſee a date for the 15th and 16th Acts; but the *Hiſtories* of the Council ſeem voluminous.

[p] Cave, as I underſtand him: Fox ſays 4 years, Vol. 1. page 782.—It began Nov. 7, 1414, and ended April 22, 1418. Dupin Compend.

[q] It began 1431, and ended 1442. Baxter.

[r] The firſt Seſſion is dated Dec. 13, 1545, and the 25th is dated Dec. 4, 1563.

[s] See Rhemiſts on Acts xv. 28.

[t] Baxter, page 431. 444. from Acts of the Council of *Baſil.* That Council depoſed Pope Eugenius IV: and the Weſtern

And Popes have alſo[u] made free with decrees of Councils.

VI. After mentioning theſe *facts*, I may make a few *remarks:* I mean ſuch as are hiſtorical.

The manner of carrying on diſputes in the larger Councils, was ſuch as promiſed no deciſion. To form, or change, a ſolid opinion in religion, much nicety of attention is requiſite; much candour, and openneſs to conviction; but no one came to a council to be convinced; every one took for granted that his own opinion was right, and aimed only at convincing others; or at attracting them by eloquence; every one took up every difficult ſubject with *paſſion*; he was ſhocked at the profaneneſs and impiety of his adverſary; he felt more horror than doubt. Yet when he was oppoſed, he was perplexed; but this only ſerved to irritate, not to ſoften or conciliate. Inability to anſwer[x], and clear up a point, never fails to exaſperate him who attempts[y] it. And thus would ariſe expreſſions of indignation, and in the end furious perſecutions. "The beginning[z] of ſtrife is as when one letteth out water."

VII. It was a great fault in Councils, that the members of them ſhould be all on one ſide of a queſtion: called, not ſo much to *argue* as to *overpower*: conſidering how abſurd this is, its frequency is aſtoniſhing: what a number of debates have been held, which were only apparent, or ſort of

Church was very adverſe to the Council of Conſtantinople, as held in the Eaſt; did not reckon it *general*, if at all valid.

[u] Baxter, page 261. 450.

[x] Some *ſpecimens* of replies may be ſeen in Baxter, page 101, &c.—105.

[y] Baxter obſerves, that the effect of Councils has been to *exaſperate*; page 100.

[z] Prov. xvii. 14.

of ſham debates! expreſſing uncertainty, whilſt every thing was fixed!

VIII. And yet it ſeems poſſible, that, for a time, warm and paſſionate debates, however unreaſonable, might be void of malice, and corrupt deſign: inexperience, and thoughtleſsneſs, with religious zeal, might be ſufficient to produce them. Good Canons of controverſy muſt be the reſult of much calm obſervation. But after a few ages, pride, ambition, a deſire of rule, or even intereſt and ſelfiſhneſs, might inſinuate themſelves; and mixing with bigotry, or ſuperſtition, might generate malice and corruption: then indirect motives would operate, for maintaining a doctrine, or humbling a rival.—In fact, at the laſt, through the indulgence and admiration given to Religion by the ordinary people, theſe faults did certainly grow to an enormous height, and ſome perſons, even in the moſt eminent religious ſtations, became, not wicked men, but monſters in human ſhape.

Nevertheleſs I am perſuaded, that though particular facts may raiſe our abhorrence, if we take a comprehenſive view of all the larger councils together, we muſt acknowledge, that great abilities were often exerted in carrying them on, and great piety: and that many venerable Prelates and Divines muſt have expoſed themſelves to great hardſhips merely with a view to promote a grand and ſolemn meeting for the purpoſe of ſettling religious truth, and [a] unanimity amongſt Chriſtian brethren [b].

IX. I will cloſe this Hiſtory with mentioning a few *writers* on Councils. In the Council of Chalcedon there is a book referred to called "Codex canonum

[a] See Baxter's account of African Councils, page 73.

[b] A good panegyric on Councils may be ſeen in Warburton's Alliance, 2. 3. 2. or page 198; from Hooker, 1. 2.

canonum[c] Eccleſiæ Univerſæ," which muſt have been a body of the decrees of only general Councils. I fear we have no ſuch book now, that is genuine, at leaſt; but we have very good collections of Councils: that by *Labbé* is an able work, but there is a finer publiſhed at Paris in 1644, in 37 volumes folio. This is the largeſt I know; the ſmalleſt, is *Berti's* compendium[d]. — Biſhop *Beveridge* has written on the ſubject a work in good eſteem; and I have often uſed a book in one volume folio, by *Long*. I think *Baxter's* book, to which I have now referred, contains ſome acute obſervations, and ſome candid ones; but allowance ſhould be made for each man's particular views and principles.

I have ſatisfaction in conſulting *Cave's* Hiſtoria Literaria, which gives ſhort accounts of Councils, and at the ſame time refers to others much longer. *Binnius* is an author in good repute, but the original records of Councils were not ſo well preſerved, as to leave no uncertainties or contradictions in the accounts which we have of them at this time. — Some writers you will find, who, though ingenious, are too ludicrous and ſlippant upon the ſubject of Councils, for my judgment; as Voltaire and Dr. Jortin[e]: theſe indulge a boyiſh kind of pertneſs, which ſhews, to me, a want of entering into the circumſtances of thoſe whom they ridicule; that is, in truth, a narrowneſs of mind. And indeed not to diſtinguiſh between the nature of anything and the abuſe of it, is always a ſign of narrow views, or haſty reflexion; of an intemperate

[c] Cave's Hiſt. Lit. 1. page 386.

[d] The writers on Eccleſ. Hiſt. Bingham, Cave, &c. refer to a Book called Hiſt. Conciliorum, or nearly that. Hume, in his Hiſtory of England, only quotes *Concil.* Tom. x. There are many accounts of Councils.

[e] Art. IX. Sect. VIII.

temperate love of wit, and a deſire to be rather humorous than accurate.

x. Let us now come to the *Explanation.*

"*General Councils.*"—A council, in common language, may ſignify any meeting of perſons who conſult with each other; but in church-hiſtory it ſeems always to imply ſome repreſentation; and the term is never uſed for any leſs ſignificant meeting than when delegates are ſent from the different churches in a[f] *Dioceſe*. A Dioceſe was once a very ſmall diſtrict; but of that another time. If all the Dioceſes in a *Province* ſend delegates, or repreſentatives, the Council is *provincial*; and the Preſident is a *metropolitan*; (for ſome one muſt preſide): if all the Provinces in a *Nation*, it is *National*[g]: and if all the Nations της οικυμενης, it is *œcumenical*, or *general*; and the Preſident muſt be elected. In fact, delegates are never ſent from all nations of the world; and therefore, according to the ſtrictneſs of this laſt definition, there never is, nor has been, a general Council; but people will talk big ſometimes; as when a large body of Chriſtians call themſelves *Catholics*; and we muſt ſometimes

[f] The meeting at *Jeruſalem* (Acts xv.) may be called a Council or not, as we follow or not theſe definitions. If all Chriſtendom, however ſmall, appeared there, virtually, it might, in ſome ſenſe, be called a *general* council, if it was a council at all.

[g] I know no name for the head of a *national* church, taken independently of the ſtate; our *Convocations* have had *Prolocutors*, anſwering to the *ſpeakers* of the Houſes of Lords and Commons. *Primate* may be the name; if ſo, our Archbiſhop of Canterbury may be *Primate* as head of the *Engliſh Church*, and *Metropolitan* as head of a *Province*. The Archbiſhop of *York* is called Primate of England; the Archbiſhop of Canterbury Primate of *all* England. York was once a reſidence of Roman Emperors: Union of Nations may (as in Aquitain, &c.) have *left* a title, which now ſeems too extenſive, though it did not when firſt given.

ſometimes follow them when they quit plain literal language. As we have no council between national and general, if a Council be compoſed of delegates from ſeveral nations, and notice be given to others, who are likely to be intereſted; it may be called a general Council without much impropriety[h]. A general council would be the moſt regularly formed, if each Church was to chuſe a repreſentative for a meeting of the churches in a Dioceſe; if each *Dioceſe* was to chuſe, out of thoſe repreſentatives, a repreſentative for a provincial council; each provincial council one for a National Council; each national council one (or more, according to its extent) for a general council: then, if all Chriſtian nations ſent repreſentatives ſo elected, one does not ſee why ſuch general council would not fairly repreſent the Catholic church.—And if ſome nations neglected to ſend, ſuppoſing they had proper notice, it would be hard if their negligence could fruſtrate the undertakings of the reſt of the Chriſtian world.

I do not know any difference between Council and *Synod*, except that the latter is Greek, and the former Latin: the Laws of councils ſeem always to be called *Canons*, though that be Greek.

XI. "*The Will of Princes*,"—ſuppoſed *Chriſtian* Princes, oppoſed probably to *Popes*: in a republic, &c. the *ſovereign* power.—Becauſe general councils are compoſed of national councils, and a prince is the head of a nation. It does not follow (whether true or not) that *Provincial* councils may not be gathered together without conſulting Princes: ſome Chriſtian councils were held before Conſtantine became a Chriſtian.

XII. "*All*

[h] Cave reaſons in order to ſettle whether the Council of Conſtantinople againſt images, in 754, was a *general* one: ſo do other writers.

XII. "*All be not governed with the ſpirit and word of God*;" — that is, ſome have ſometimes *worldly* views;—the expreſſions of our Article are directly oppoſite to one in the *Rhemiſh*[i] Teſtament; —"Holy Counſels" "have ever the aſſiſtance of God's *Spirit*, and therefore cannot *erre*," &c.—And the Council of Chalcedon cry out, "theſe are the words of the *Holy*[k] *Ghoſt*."

XIII. "*May err*,"—a priori;—and à poſteriori, "*have erred*," "even in things pertaining unto *God*:"—it was, in 1552, "not only in *worldly* matters, but alſo," &c.; this compariſon makes our expreſſion more intelligible; and the change makes our aſſent more eaſy: it was a needleſs trouble to prove that Councils had erred "in worldly matters:"—worldly matters are not expreſſed in the *Latin* of 1552.

Our church reſpects Councils; though it will found Salvation on the Scriptures:—It ſays, "they" *ſometimes* "have erred:" and "things ordained by them as neceſſary to Salvation," muſt be tried by *Scripture*; but this implies, that in anything ſhort of that, Councils ought to be reſpected. And accordingly, our Homily on faſting, ſpeaks handſomely[l] of the Council of *Chalcedon*.

"Unleſs it may be *declared*," &c. this ſeems rather obſcure; or however leſs clear than the Latin, "niſi oſtendi poſſint è ſacris literis eſſe deſumpta,"—But if Salvation is to be founded on Scripture, the Councils may ſeem to have nothing to do with our principles; yet they may ſuggeſt, argue, interpret; and their opinion, when they do ſo, may afford us light; and is to be attended to, and

[i] Rhemiſts on Acts xv. 28.
[k] Baxter, page 101.
[l] Page 217, 8vo.—See alſo Reform. Legum de Summâ Trinitate, &c. Cap. 14. which is more clear and full than our Articles.

and treated with reverence: it may have *weight*, ſometimes great weight, with thoſe who are not qualified to judge.

XIV. We come to our *Proof*.

There ſeem but two propoſitions to be noticed;

XV. General Councils cannot be called without the conſent of *Princes*.

General Councils are made up of Delegates from National Councils; and according to us, the Prince is the head of the national Church. How far the conſent of the Sovereign is neceſſary for a man's quitting his own country, is a matter of *National Law*; but I think moraliſts deem ſuch conſent neceſſary; either expreſs or *tacit*; at leaſt when ſubjects travel in any conſiderable numbers; or for ends affecting the State to which they belong.—The Chriſtian religion leaves the political obligations of ſubjects in their full force.—(See Matt. xxii. 15, &c —Rom. xiii. 1, &c.)—If ſome ſpiritual Magiſtrate could call a number of every nation out to a diſtant region, it muſt greatly interrupt internal Government: and if people ſo called out could make what rules they pleaſed about Religion, including diſcipline, morals, ſpiritual Courts, &c. and the Magiſtrate at home muſt execute thoſe rules, he would be thwarted and impeded in ſome very important parts of his adminiſtration.

XVI. General Councils have *erred*.—If we give any farther proof of this than has already appeared, it will be for the ſake of reflecting on the Hiſtory of the Church. Indeed it would be ſufficient if we proved that Romaniſts muſt own general Councils to have erred, for our preſent Article is only againſt the Romaniſts: and in this view, we might repeat what was[m] before ſaid about Councils depoſing

[m] Section v.

depoſing Popes, and Popes neglecting Councils. And we might add the inſtance of Pope *Honorius*, who was depoſed as a Monothelite by the general council of Conſtantinople in the ſeventh Century[n]. General Councils have *contradicted*[o] each other, in which caſe one muſt err; that at *Rimini* was[p] at laſt *Arian*. And I fear, if we examined the firſt four, we ſhould not find them all free from error. Lardner does not find the Council of *Nice* ſuch as he approves; chiefly with regard to toleration.—As I remember, it orders people to *ſtand* during prayer; a ſmall error perhaps: the *Papiſts* muſt think it ſets the churches of Jeruſalem, Alexandria and Antioch too high.

For the firſt general Council of *Conſtantinople* we may refer to Gregory[q] of Nazianzum, or to the expoſtulations of the Biſhop of Rome: it was noiſy and diſorderly, and ambitious to have all church-buſineſs done in the[r] Eaſt.—I do not ſcruple to ſay, that the general council of *Epheſus* erred in treating Neſtorius[s] with too great *ſeverity*. —The riot and warm oppoſition of John of Antioch; the calling in of a military force; fraud, priſon, baniſhment, all theſe may be ſaid not to be chargeable upon the *Council*; they were not likely to make the Council free from error; riots in any aſſembly are always a diſgrace to it, and a great hindrance to right deciſions, though rioters can

[n] Art. 11 Sect. x.

[o] Long's Councils, page 266.—Baxter on Councils, page 99. 445, or compare page 98. Sect 9, with page 100, Sect. 17: and the Council at Conſtantinople in 754, with the ſecond Nicene Council in 787, about images.—See alſo Biſhop Porteus's Brief Confutation, page 30.

[p] Bennet on the Article.

[q] Baxter, page 67, 69.—Gibbon, Vol. 3. (contents)

[r] Baxter, page 70. Sect. 11.

[s] And ſee Baxter, page 94. Sect. 20. and Art. 11. Sect. VIII.

can never be all on one ſide.—The Council of *Chalcedon* was a ſcene of contention, as far as concerned the Eutychians; the claims made at it are ſcarcely intelligible; and the Legates of the *Pope* proteſted againſt the eighteenth canon[t]. The Eutychian debate in that Council was curious enough; no one knew how to oppoſe Eutyches without favouring Neſtorius, who had been depoſed at Epheſus; nor therefore without condemning the preceding general Council; this difficulty I can conceive to have been the occaſion of irritating and exaſperating the Fathers, and ſo, of much riot and diſorder, both before and at the Council of Chalcedon. The difference between Neſtorius and Eutyches (if any[u], at bottom) was ſo ſubtle and refined, that no one could explain himſelf clearly upon it.

Here Biſhop *Porteus's* chapter[x] might be introduced.

XVII. I will carry the Proof no farther, but ſee what can be ſaid in the way of *Application*.—No new form of aſſent ſeems wanting.—And I doubt whether any propoſals of mutual conceſſions would be effectual, ſo bigotted is Du Pin[y] in this matter. Except indeed he means, that ſuppoſing a general council ſuch as it *ſhould* be, it would be abſurd for a *private* man to ſet up his own judgment againſt it; if he means this, we might agree with him. And the chief part of what is ſaid in order to inculcate a veneration for general councils, is derived from their

[t] Cave, 1. 485. Its deſign was, to make the Biſhop of Conſtantinople equal to the Biſhop of Rome, Conſtantinople being new Rome. The breach this occaſioned between *Eaſt* and *Weſt* has never been healed to this day. Baxter, page 70.

[u] Baxter, page 102.

[x] Brief Confutation, Part 1. Chap. 6.

[y] Appendix to Moſheim, as before.

their *nature*, and excludes all ſuppoſition of their being *abuſed*.—But if we ſpeak of General Councils as what they have been in fact, it ſeems to me that *Papiſts* have full as much reaſon to declare them fallible, as *Proteſtants*.

As to *Improvement*, the *idea* of improving general councils is quite ſimple; take away their *faults*, and they are improved, and uſeful. A council of Chriſtians literally *general*, ſeems ſcarcely attainable in our age, becauſe the Greek Church muſt be admitted to it, as alſo Aſiatic and African churches; though anything *might* be done by carrying repreſentation far enough, or, what means the ſame, by reducing the number of repreſentatives.

Yet we can ſcarce conceive, that in *fact* a ſmall number of repreſentatives would be allowed to bind the univerſal Church, without having their acts ratified by their conſtituents: and ſuch ratification would conſume ſo much *time*, as, in many caſes, to render the Councils uſeleſs. Indeed the time ſpent merely in the journeys of very diſtant repreſentatives *to* the place of meeting would make an inſuperable difficulty, What would be the caſe if we ſuppoſed both *America* and *Aſia* wholly Chriſtian?

No Council would be ſo bad now as ſome were when the Clergy were ignorant and profligate; but we are not yet arrived at a manner of diſputing productive of mutual conviction; let controverſy then be improved and humanized; by our *writings* let us ſhew, that we are *fit to meet*: And then, let our councils at firſt be ſmall; and let them be enlarged as we find them produce unanimity.

If we could thus proceed on till there was a probability of ſome good from conſulting with our

our moſt diſtant brethren, it would be a cheering proſpect; it would fill our minds with hope, that the Church of Chriſt might, in ſome finite time, become in fact, what it always was in theory, *Univerſal.*

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXII.

OF PURGATORY.

THE Romiſh doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worſhipping and Adoration, as well of Images as of Reliques, and alſo Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing, vainly invented, and grounded upon no warrantry of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God.

I. Although this Article is intitled, "Of Purgatory," it contains ſeveral other ſubjects. We will make ſome *hiſtorical* remarks on them in the order in which they occur; but it may be obſerved of every one of them, that it began in a time of Superſtition; that it became popular becauſe it flattered or intereſted mens feelings and imaginations; that it got fixed in the dark ages; that it became lucrative to the ſacred orders, or advanced their power; and therefore, as well as becauſe it had become aſſociated with religious principles and ſentiments, at the revival of learning, it was not given up.

II. With regard to *Purgatory* in particular, though it may not be founded in either reaſon or ſcripture, it is not *unnatural:* who can bear the thought of dwelling in *everlaſting* torments[a]? yet who can ſay, that a juſt God will not inflict them? the

[a] Iſ. xxxiii. 14.

—the mind of man ſeeks ſome *reſource*; it finds one only in conceiving that ſome temporary puniſhment after death, may purify the ſoul from its moral pollutions, and make it at laſt acceptable even to a Deity perfectly pure. Hence the notion of the ſoul's *tranſmigration*; and hence it is, that the Epic[b] Poets repreſent departed Spirits as uttering complaints at the continuance of their ſufferings.—Yet ſome make a difference between men profeſſedly *wicked*, and ſuch as only are compaſſed about with *infirmities*; the wicked they give up to puniſhment eternal; but the weak they hope may be made perfect by temporary ſufferings; or, in other words, they conceive, that thoſe who have committed *mortal* ſins, and not repented of them, will be puniſhed for ever in Hell; but that thoſe who have committed only[c] *venial* ſins, will only ſuffer for a time in *Purgatory*.—We have already[d] mentioned the laſt Article of 1552 concerning the final ſalvation of all men; containing Dr. *Hartley's* doctrine; and that of *Origen*[e]:—but that relates to all kinds of ſins, and to a termination of all kinds of puniſhment.

Some have fixed upon the element of *Fire* as the inſtrument by which men were to be purified from their venial ſins. That element was little underſtood, and is exceedingly powerful; which is enough

[b] Homer, Virgil, mentioned by *Burnet*, who alſo mentions a *platonic* notion to the purpoſe; but he refers to no *paſſage*.—Forbes, 13. 2, refers to Plato, Cicero, Virgil, &c. but not to Homer, that I ſee.

[c] Art. XV. Sect. XII. XXI. XXIII.

[d] Art. XVIII. Sect. V.

[e] Aug. Hær. 43. "purgationem malorum," &c. Reform. Legum. de Hær. cap. 11. See the end of Somnium Scipionis. In this 43d Hær. Aug. ſays, that he has oppoſed "diligentiſſimè" Origen, and the *Philoſophers* from whom he borrowed his doctrine; De Civitate Dei.

enough to occaſion myſtical and ſuperſtitious[f] opinions and feelings about it; and even to make its operations to be aſcribed to *perſonal* cauſes.—The ſoul has been thought to be itſelf[g] fire; and different[h] nations have entertained conceptions of departed Spirits being affected by fire; but we muſt not go far into ſuch matters at preſent.—There are expreſſions of *Scripture*, which may have helped forward the adoption of ſuch an opinion into revealed religion; as Pſ. civ. 4.—Mal. iii. 2.—Matt. iii. 11.—Acts ii. 3.—See Cruden's Concordance, under *Fire*.

Some *Chriſtians* ſeem to have had, in very early times, ſome notions of a temporary puniſhment after death, purifying the ſoul; *Carpocrates*[i] and *Montanus* are particularly mentioned. The oriental Chriſtians were diſpoſed to believe the tranſmigration of ſouls, from their belief of the impurity of matter. The *Manicheans* in particular, did profeſs that doctrine[k]. Yet the *Greek* Church, though eaſtern, never held any purification after this life.

Auguſtin was, in his youth, a Manichean, though only an auditor, never one of the elect. He, in ſome way or other, had acquired a notion of an *ignis purgatorius*[l];—but he made no article of *Faith* about it; he only went ſo far as to ſay, "non *incredibile*[m] videtur," and on other occaſions, he expreſſed

[f] Cic. de Nat. Deorum, 1. 15. 2. 15. 3. 14.

[g] Cic. Tuſc. diſp. 1. 9. end, "*vulgò*"—and Sect. 11. "Si ignis, extinguetur." (anima).

[h] See Michaelis, Introd. Sect. 101, page 245, quarto.

[i] See Fulke on the Rhem. Teſt. from Irenæus and Tertullian. Matt. v. Sect. 1.—He adds the *Origeniſts*, Matt. xii. Sect. 6.—Forbes's Inſtruct. 13. 2. 4.

[k] Lardner, Vol. 3, page 476.—Vol. 9, page 421, 422.—See alſo Append. to Book 1. Sect. IV. or Vol. 1, page 351.

[l] Enchiridion, Cap. 29. [m] Ad Dulcitii Quæſt. 1.

expreſſed great doubtfulneſs[n]; and when he treated of the Limbus infantum, in which children, dying unbaptized, were ſuppoſed to exiſt, he proved, in general, that there was *no third* ſtate beſides heaven and[o] hell:—at leaſt, that of ſuch ſtate we are perfectly ignorant, and that it is not mentioned in the Scriptures.

After the time of Auguſtin the notion of purgatory kept *growing* in the church; but it was only ſuppoſed to purify men from ſlight[p] faults; as immoderate laughing, or inordinate domeſtic cares, &c.

The *Schoolmen*, as uſual, run into minute particulars; *Thomas Aquinas*, for inſtance, mentions, that it is the *ſame fire* which torments the damned in Hell, and the juſt in Purgatory[q]: and that the leaſt puniſhment in purgatory, exceeds the greateſt in this life.—But I do not ſee that he mentions from whence he derives his knowledge.

The Council of *Trent* rather ſeems to take for granted the doctrine of Purgatory, as fixed by Fathers, Councils, &c. than to define it. In the ſixth Seſſion, about Juſtification, it anathematizes all[r], who ſay, that ſins are remitted in Chriſt, in ſuch ſenſe as to leave no *temporal* puniſhment due. And in the twenty-fifth Seſſion[s], it decrees, that the

[n] Veneer on this Article refers to paſſages; Enchir. 66. 68. Quæſt. Dulc. 1.—De Fide et operibus, cap. 16.

[o] De Verbis Apoſt. Ser. 14. Hypognoſt. Cont. Pelag. l. 5. (reckoned ſpurious).——Fulke on Rhemiſh Teſt. Matt. xii. Sect. 6.

[p] Fulke, ibidem, from Gregory the Great, A. D. 590.—Veneer obſerves, that the 5th Gen. Council, in condemning the Origeniſts, did not mention any *other* Purgatory.

[q] Quoted by Forbes, 13. 1. 5. in 4 Sentent. diſt. 21. quæſt. 1.—Farther ſubtleties are mentioned by Forbes in the ſame place.

[r] Canon 30. [s] Opening.

the *ſound* doctrine of Purgatory ſhall be preached, ſetting aſide all nice and ſubtle queſtions; but does not ſay wherein that ſound doctrine conſiſts.—It mentions nothing of *Fire*; perhaps in order to avoid abſtruſe ſpeculations.—But in the Rhemiſh Teſtament, the notion of a fiery[t] purgatory ſeems to be kept up. *Du Pin*, in his negotiation with Archbiſhop Wake, "obſerves, that ſouls muſt be *purged*; that is, purified from all defilement of ſin, before they are admitted to celeſtial bliſs; that the Church of Rome doth not affirm this to be done by fire;" &c.

I here cloſe the Hiſtory of *Purgatory*.

III. The next thing mentioned in the Article is "*Pardons*;" this means the ſame as *Indulgences*, the Latin being *Indulgentiæ*; but from the Rhemiſh Teſtament it ſeems likely, that *Pardons* was the more common term at the time of the Reformation[u]. I have explained the nature of theſe under the fourteenth Article. We may add here a few inſtances. Extravagant indulgences, or pardons, were granted to thoſe who would undertake to join in the *Cruſades*[x]. And in order to encourage men to appear at the Council of *Trent*, the Legates and Archbiſhop of Trent, granted three years and one hundred and ſixty days of deliverance from Purgatory, to any one, that ſhould appear at that city at the opening of the Council.—As I am not conſidering Hiſtory with the moſt ſcrupulous nicety (though I would not willingly make any miſtake,) I take the account of Mr. *Voltaire*, who adds, that indulgences are ſtill *ſold* very cheap at Rome, ſo as

[t] On 1 Cor. iii. 15.

[u] In the Index, we find, "Indulgences, ſee Pardons."

[x] In the Cruſade of Richard I. the expedition was to anſwer to Sinners inſtead of all Penances.—Innocent III. was liberal of indulgences. Cave.

as to be re-ſold in the Swiſs Cantons at *four ſols* apiece; but that the great profit made of them is in *Spaniſh America*, where people are more rich and more ignorant than in the ſmall Swiſs Cantons[y].

Jubilees were inſtituted in order to grant indulgences. *Bower*, in his Life of Pope Boniface[z] VIII. ſays, that, in the year 1300, on ſome rumours of pardons having been granted at the end of the preceding century (year 1200,) the Pope appointed the firſt Chriſtian Jubilee: and gave public notice, that every man, repenting, confeſſing, and fully abſolved, who ſhould, during the laſt[a] year of any Century, viſit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul (at Rome) once a day, for thirty days, ſhould have a full indulgence: the extent of which has not always been underſtood in the ſame[b] ſenſe.—It has been computed, that two hundred thouſand ſtrangers, have been at Rome in one jubilee-year; and that the mere braſs money, offered by the lower people, excluſive of ſilver and gold offered by the more opulent, has amounted in one year to fifty thouſand florins of gold. Since the year 1300, the Jubilees have been made to return more frequently; there has now long been one every[c] twenty-five years.

IV. The Hiſtory of *Images* might be long; becauſe the uſe of them is calculated to produce diſputes. To contemplate reſemblances of perſons whom we love or admire, is naturally pleaſing and

[y] Vol. 10th, quarto. page 151. 162.

[z] Bower's Lives of Popes, Vol. 6, page 354.—Chambers's Dict. *Jubilee*.

[a] Perhaps 99 is moſt properly the laſt year, but, if 101 be called the firſt year, 100 muſt be the laſt.

[b] Art. XIV. Sect. 1.—See alſo Fulke on 2 Cor. ii. 10. (Rhem. Teſt.)

[c] Chambers.

and intereſting to the mind. And if perſons, who have greatly promoted or ſuffered for the cauſe of Religion, are departed out of life, ſtill the Devout may be greatly affected by a lively repreſentation of their appearance and manner. But when the perſon repreſented ſeems to have any claim to religious adoration, the reſemblance occaſions ſome danger. The Heathens had images of their Gods; but it is probable that at firſt each image was only regarded as a mere reſemblance; continual aſſociation of the ideas of the inviſible original, and the viſible reſemblance, united them in the mind, and took away the diſtinction between them. Ere long the very ſight of the Image raiſed all thoſe ſentiments, thoſe devout affections, which at firſt ſeemed appropriated to the original.

This tranſition of the feelings from the original to the Image, may take place, on different occaſions, and in different degrees. Suppoſe then Images in any place of worſhip; to remove them, is to take away a great deal of that on which the devout mind feeds, and by which it ſupports itſelf: to leave them, is to draw the mind on, nearer and nearer, to Idolatry. What diſputes and contentions might not ariſe on the propoſal of ſuch meaſures! – And diſputes of this nature might be forwarded by a conflict between love and hatred for the[d] polite arts.—We might give more or fewer examples of theſe things; but they would ſuggeſt only this general obſervation.

As the *early Chriſtians* had occaſion to contend againſt Idolatry, it ſeems natural that they ſhould have an abhorrence of images. We may well therefore conſider the accounts of the ſtatue of Chriſt

[d] Art. XX. Sect. I. and VII.

Chriſt ſent to King *Abgarus*, and the paintings [e] of St. *Luke*, as fabulous. The Emperor *Theodoſius* forbade all incenſe, &c. to Idols, (ſenſu carentibus ſimulacris), under penalty of forfeiture of the houſes or lands where ſuch act of ſuperſtition was committed [f].—*Auguſtin* ſeems uneaſy [g] at the multiplying [h] of paintings and ſtatues in his time, though the political and hiſtorical uſe of them was not denied. In the fifth and ſixth Centuries they multiplied ſtill more; no one had time to lay any reſtraints, ſo buſy were the leaders of the church with other matters. About the year 600 *Serenus* Biſhop of Marſeilles began to attack them with violence; Pope *Gregory* half commended him, but rather ſoothed mens deſire for images upon the whole: however, it got fixed for ſome time, as a compromiſe, that it was right to *have* images, but wrong to *worſhip* them [i].

We may paſs on to the Emperor *Leo* III. called the *Iſaurian*; a man of an imperious and violent ſpirit. Provoked by ſomething of no very great conſequence, he publiſhed an Edict againſt Images in 726, and demoliſhed them in great numbers; and in 754 they were condemned at a Council at *Conſtantinople* called a *general* [k] one: in 787 was held the ſecond *Nicene* council, on which the Romaniſts found their worſhip of Images: they ſpeak of it

[e] See Forbes, 7. 8, and Dr. Middleton's Letter from Rome, page 173, &c.

[f] Leg. 12, page 15, quoted by Middleton, page 158.

[g] The *Anthropomorphites* might be mentioned here: Aug. Hær. 50.—Baxter's Councils, page 76, Sect. 39.

[h] Ep. 102, (al. 49,) Tom. 1. page 212. Edit. Antv.

[i] This ſeems to be adopted by the *Neceſſary Doctrine*; as mentioned Art. VII. Note at the end of Sect. XIII.

[k] Cave argues for its being called a general one.—Compare, in Baxter's Councils, No. 228, with No. 232.—Partic. page 226, Sect. 55.—Some mention made of this Council, Art. XXI. Sect. X.

it as if it had been the unanimous act of all Chriſtians, and oppoſed to[1] no other act. Yet it was called by an abandoned Empreſs, *Irene*, who had cauſed her huſband to be poiſoned, and afterwards put out her ſon's eyes.—The oppoſition had now cauſed much effuſion of blood, as well as the revolt of the Exarchate of Italy (Ravenna the capital) from the eaſtern Empire. In 794, Charlemagne held a Council at *Frankfort*, intending to moderate the fury of the contending parties; and he alſo publiſhed ſome writings.—In 814 there was another Council at Conſtantinople againſt images: and one at *Paris* in 825, but in that the adoration of the Croſs was encouraged.

In the ſucceeding centuries, till the Reformation, the paſſion for Images grew ſtill ſtronger; but men of ſober minds grew to be offended: and that was one cauſe of the Reformation.

The favourers of Images have been called *Iconolatræ*, and Iconoduli; and their adverſaries, *Iconomachi*, and Iconoclaſtæ.—Cave calls the eighth century Seculum Eiconoclaſticum.

John of Damaſcus, called uſually *Damaſcene*, whom Lardner and Cave place in 730, was a famous writer in favour of images; he was of a great family, and eminent for his learning; but on account of his credulity, which was the fault of his time, he is not always to be depended upon.—Pope *Adrian* I. wrote againſt Charlemagne, but got no fame[m].

After

[1] Rhem. Teſt. end of 1 John.—Trent, Seſſion 25, page 202, duodecimo.

[m] The *Collyridians* (Epiphan. Hær. 79.) might be mentioned, as it was to the *Image* of the Virgin that they offered their *Cake*, (κολλυρα, its dim. κολλυρις)—(See Fulke on Rhem. Heb. ix. Sect. 4.) And what Forbes relates of *Theodore Œliota* (a new way of preferring ſacrifice to Mercy,) *might* be read in *Latin*;

After the Reformation began, the demolition of Images was conſidered as part of the deſtruction of Popery. The Puritans wiſhed the demolition to be total.

Popiſh countries abound with[n] Images ſtill.—They have, or have had, Images of the *Deity*[o]; but what we hear moſt of, are thoſe of *Chriſt*, and his earthly *Parent*, and ſome *Angels*, and many *Saints*. Some of theſe are very[p] rich, others ſo mean as to be ridiculous to any but the loweſt people.—An image "of Chriſt upon the Croſs, with Mary[q] and John ſtanding by," uſed to be called, in England, a *Rood*.

At *Liſbon*, as I have been told by one who ſpoke of what he had *ſeen*, there is a ſtatue of the Virgin in a large full-bottomed wig, with Jeſus, as a Boy, dreſſed in a Sword and bag-wig, with a Violin in his Hand.—Sir Edwin *Sandys* ſays, that "Where one voweth to Chriſt, ten vow unto her," (the Virgin), "and not ſo much to herſelf, as to ſome peculiar image," &c.—"for one miracle reported

Latin; if it is, the approbation of Adrian I. and the ſecond Nicene Council, ſhould not be forgotten.—Forbes 7. 2. 30.—7. 11. 33.

Here alſo might be mentioned "the Doctrine of *School-authors*" (Art. of 1552) from Forbes 7. 2. 26, 27, 28.—And it might be ſeen, at the ſame time, how "the *Romiſh* Doctrine," (Art. of 1562) differs from the Scholaſtic.—In the Article of 1552 the expreſſion is, "The Doctrine of *School-authors* concerning Purgatory," &c.—In ours, of 1562, "The *Romiſh* doctrine concerning Purgatory," &c. in other things the Articles are much the ſame.

[n] Middleton's Letter from Rome.

[o] Rhem. Teſt. on Acts xvii. 29. ſhews how Images of *God the Father* were made from Dan. vii. 22 alſo with a *Globe* in his hand, from no ſcripture; and of the *Trinity*, from Gen. xviii. 2. and defends them.

[p] Our Lady of Loretto, &c. Midd. page 154, 155. Speculum Europæ, page 4.

[q] Neal, Hiſt. Pur. 1. page 102. Holyrood Houſe.

reported to be wrought by the Crucifix, not ſo few perhaps as an hundred are voiced upon thoſe other Images[r]." This traveller ſpeaks from his own obſervation; and ſo does Dr. *Middleton* in later times, when he tells us of ſeveral women whom he ſaw ſitting before the Altar of a Saint, each a[s] child in her lap, "in expectation of his miraculous influence on the health of the Infant."

The Council of *Trent* mention the Romaniſts as kiſſing images, and proſtrating themſelves before them; as well as being uncovered in paying them reſpect: the images ſpecified are thoſe of *Chriſt*, the *Virgin*, and *other* Saints, to whom *due* honour is to be given.—*Due* honour ſhould certainly be given to every thing.

The alteration made by the Romaniſts in the ſecond *commandment* was mentioned Art. VII. Sect. XIII.

V. There is a connexion or analogy between Images and *Relics*; both deriving their efficacy from aſſociation of ideas between the thing and an intereſting perſon. What was ſaid of Images, will, in great meaſure apply to Relics. It is natural to be affected by a relic of any one loved, admired, or venerated: the ſight of it makes our regret, affection, &c. lively and ſtrong: and the place where the remains of any departed friend are depoſited, will come under the notion of a Relic. Virgil's Tomb has been viſited with a tender intereſt.—Some perſons of our own country would, in the laſt Century, have very highly valued, and paſſionately contemplated, any relic of *Charles*

[r] Sir Edward Sandys's Speculum Europæ, page 4 and 5.—See alſo Midd. page 152.

[s] Letter from Rome, page 167. if there be no *Image* near this Altar, the inſtance may belong to Sect. VI.

Charles I. or a twig of the Royal Oak by means of which his ſon eſcaped.

But religion, in this as in other things, heightens our feelings. In Mr. Maſon's *Caractacus*[t] we find a ſentiment excited by Druidical relics. I can conceive a degree of affection or enthuſiaſm to have ariſen from a relic of one of our venerable Martyrs in the time of Queen *Mary*.

It requires meditation and knowledge of Antiquity rather than reaſoning, to ſee what the *early Chriſtians* muſt have felt on contemplating what they believed to be remains of Saints, Martyrs, Apoſtles, their bleſſed Lord himſelf! agitated by continual danger, haraſſed by paſſionate exertions to ſpread the religion which they profeſſed!—I do not mean, that the *primitive* Chriſtians imagined themſelves to be really in poſſeſſion of remains of Chriſt and the Apoſtles; for the primitive times are charged with no weakneſs of the kind; but when a paſſion for relics once began to prevail, it ſpread more eaſily becauſe of the habitual feelings of Chriſtians; and, we may add, becauſe of the credulity of the times. A paſſionate attention to the fate of *Martyrs*, and to every thing belonging to them, one cannot wonder at, in Chriſtians of any age. Put yourſelf into the place of Chriſtians in the fourth century, for inſtance; conceive how highly they muſt regard thoſe whom they had ſeen ſuffering with conſtancy to the laſt extremity; imagine how they muſt be united together, and how their union muſt heighten their mutual ſympathy; and you will not be ſurprized, that they ſhould meet at the *Tombs of the Martyrs*, and there offer up their *prayers*[u] to God and their Lord, as

[t] Line 236.

[u] See *Aërians*, in Lardner's Works, Vol. 4, page 306.—Alſo a quotation from *Tertullian* de Coronâ Militis, C. 1, 2, 3. in Wall's Inf. Baptiſm, page 480, quarto.

as Chriſtians, and confirm their reſolutions of following the noble example of the deceaſed, in caſe they ſhould be called upon to ſo ſevere a trial.—But it is to be feared, that the ſcene was ſometimes too much for their ſober reaſon: they fancied things without juſt foundation, they believed without ſufficient proof; and ſome, thinking the ſpirit good, muſt have tranſgreſſed the bounds of truth in *inventing* what might nouriſh and enflame it.—If this was the caſe, any number of falſe relics might be produced and circulated: any voices might be heard[x].

Auguſtin muſt have been ſenſible of a fooliſh exceſs in this matter, by the terms in which he abuſes the *idle Monks*; ſome of whom *wandered* about. "Alii membra Martyrum, ſi tamen Martyrum, venditant."—(De Op. Monach. cap. 28.)

About the end of the fourth Century, the fondneſs for relics was ridiculed by *Vigilantius*, poſſibly with too little caution: *Jerom* writes againſt him, but not exactly as one would wiſh; however, he is rather to be called over ſerious and declamatory than extravagant[y], or wrong in his fundamental opinions.

John *Damaſcene*, in reaſoning on Images, takes relics as a ground[z] or axiom.

In

[x] The word *Memories* is often made uſe of: Du Freſne gives ſeveral different ſenſes of it, but I think not that of what we call *Apparitions*.—*Memoria*—a ſepulcre; in pl. a *celebration*, which ſeems to have been paſſionate, with ſome geſtures and ſalutations.—A receptacle of a corpſe.—A chapel—a *box* holding relics.—Anything which had been uſed by the deceaſed, as his *Staff*, &c.—*funeral* rites—and *Feſtivals*, ſuch as we call *Saints' Days*.

[y] See Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. Argument to St. Luke's Goſpel; and on Acts xix. Sect. 8.

[z] Forbes, 7. 2. 27. end. If I am to adore the original Croſs, the Spear, the Sponge, why not images of man's making, for the Glory of Chriſt? &c. in this way.

In dark ages, the paſſion for relics probably grew ſtronger, and the veneration paid to them more ſolemn; but I know of no great events which they produced.

The Council of *Trent* ſays, that all thoſe are to be condemned who affirm, that "*worſhip*" (venerationem) and *honour* is not due to relics; or that it is paid unprofitably; or that the *Memories* of Saints are celebrated in vain. It alſo preſcribes rules for the admiſſion of new relics.

The lower ranks of *Romaniſts* have carried their veneration for relics to ſuch a childiſh exceſs, as to give occaſion to numberleſs forgeries; ſuch as bring contempt and diſgrace upon Chriſtianity, and by being believed by the ſuperſtitious, though incredible to any man of ſenſe, promote *infidelity* in things of importance. Every traveller into Popiſh countries recounts numberleſs ſtories about them, and the miracles[a] which they perform.

VI. The laſt thing to be mentioned, is the invocation of *Saints:* Saints are often invoked by a perſon preſent with their *Images*, or their *relics*; but the ideas of their Images or relics, ſhould be kept diſtinct from that of Invocation. I hope no man is fooliſh for being affected when he meditates on the manner of exiſtence of his departed friends; or for indulging ſome indiſtinct hope of ſeeing them again: nor any Chriſtian, for feeling an intereſt in all thoſe, of all ages, who have departed this Life in the faith of Chriſt; as well as in thoſe of his own generation; or for conceiving, that there ſubſiſts between them that degree of intercourſe, fellow-feeling, ſympathy, which their reſpective natures are capable of: Such a ſuppoſed common intereſt, is the communion of *Saints*.

Cicero,

[a] In the Decree of the Council of Trent, Seſſ. 25, the word "*beneficia*" is uſed, not miracula.

Cicero[b], ſpeaking in the character of Cato Major, deſcribes every good man as warmly intereſted, both in thoſe who have departed this life before him, and in thoſe who are to live after him: his, "*divinum concilium cætuſque animorum*," makes one imagine, that the communion of Saints would have been to him a very pleaſing Article of Faith, had he lived under Chriſtianity. In ſaying this, Cicero is ſeldom conſidered as fooliſh or culpable; but had he paid religious honours to any of his worthies; had he made *Images* of them, or procured ſome forged *relics* as belonging to them; and had he kiſſed theſe, proſtrated himſelf before them, *invoked* the worthies, and deſired their interceſſion with Jupiter or Pluto; we ſhould now have different notions of his wiſdom, from thoſe which we do entertain. How weak then ſhould we have thought him if he had done ſuch things towards men of no value: or on account of perſons whoſe real character was wholly unknown[c] to him!

We are told, that, invocation of Saints was a thing unknown to Chriſtians for at leaſt[d] three hundred years; and that none of the Fathers, in plain ſerious writing ſaid, that *Servitus* was due to Saints, for ſix hundred years.

How ſoon Chriſtians ran into exceſs in worſhipping Saints, appears from the ſecond African Council, held A. D. 401, (Cave). In this it is ordered, that the *Altars* which are ſet up every where in the *fields*, or in the *ways*, to Martyrs, be overthrown by the Biſhops, except the Body, or ſome *undoubted* relics be there. It is alſo ſaid, that

[b] De Senectute ad finem.
[c] Middleton's Letter, page 173, 174.
[d] Biſhop Porteus, Part ii. Chap. 1. and Forbes, 7. 1. 17.

that Altars had been ſet up by "*dreams* and vain *revelations*."

Invocation of Saints probably proceeded much in the ſame manner with the other abuſes mentioned in this Article; it is ſo intimately connected with them. What *Vigilantius* wrote againſt *Martyrs*, extends to *Saints*; Martyrs were often fainted: and his reaſoning affects the Invocation of Saints; as he affirms, that the ſouls of Saints were not, as was uſually preſumed, preſent with their Bodies; or at their monuments; much leſs could they be preſent at every place where their relics happened to be preſerved[e].

The Council of *Trent* joins Invocation of Saints with Relics and Images. All men are to be condemned (damnandi ſunt) who do not own, that the Saints, reigning with Chriſt, offer their prayers to God for men; and that it is uſeful to invoke them in order to get their aſſiſtance; in aſking God for bleſſings through Chriſt.

Cardinal Bellarmin ſays, as we find in Forbes, 7. 1. 12. "Sanctis angelis et hominibus deberi cultum aliquem *religioſum*," (de Sanct. Beat. cap. 13.) but then he explains *religioſum* by "majorem merè *humano*."

Biſhop *Porteus* gives us[f] a collection of terms in which Papiſts addreſs the *Virgin Mary*; and mentions alterations of the Pſalms, Te Deum, &c. made in order to ſuit them to her. Forms may be found in the Popiſh Liturgies, and in Forbes[g]; and in Rogers on this Article.

For

[e] On this and the preceding paragraph, ſee Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. Apoc. vi. Sect. 1.

[f] Biſhop Porteus, Part ii. Chap. ii.

[g] Forbes, 7. 2. 19, – See alſo Fulke on Rhem. Teſt.—John xvi. ſect. 3. and 1 Cor. ii. ſect. 4.

For other inſtances of modern invocation of Saints, I will refer to Dr. Middleton's Letter from [h] Rome; and to books of travels which are in every one's hands. It may be as well not to omit the idea, which ſome have encouraged, in order to obviate the difficulty ariſing from the limited knowledge of the Saints; that *Angels inform the Saints* what is addreſſed to them: *Forbes* mentions this notion[i], but he does not ſay by whom it was held.—It may alſo be right to refer to the ſame writer in order to ſhew, that the Schoolmen held the ſame with the Romaniſts; as the Article of 1552 affirms of the *Schoolmen*, what the Article of 1562 affirms of the Church of *Rome*[k].

VII. But I will not purſue this Hiſtory farther; I will now proceed to ſome *Explanation*.

Purgatory may be defined, a ſtate, in which the ſouls of men, popularly called *good* men, (according to what was ſaid under Art. XV.) though not wholly free from *faults* and infirmities, are confined, till they are *purified*, probably by ſuffering, from all thoſe faults and infirmities, and fitted for an entrance into *heaven*, and the more immediate preſence of a Deity of perfect Holineſs.

Why the title of the Article ſhould be "*Of Purgatory*," when it includes other Doctrines, might poſſibly be in ſome meaſure explained.—All the things mentioned in the Body of the Article, after Purgatory, have been chiefly uſed as means of ſhortening the duration of its pains[l]. *Indulgences* have that end chiefly and immediately in view. And adorations are offered to *Saints*, through

[h] Dr. Middleton's Letter from Rome, page 176.—The paſſage, quoted Sect. IV. might have been here.

[i] Forbeſii Inſtruct 7. 1. 20. [k] Forbeſii Inſtruct. 7. 2. 4.

[l] The Council of Trent mixes theſe doctrines, Seſſ. 25.

through the medium of *Images* or *Relics*, chiefly in order to prevail upon them to aſſiſt in delivering ſouls out of *Purgatory*. So that the Article might have been entitled, 'Of Purgatory, and the means of abridging its Pains,' were it not that each ſubject may require ſome ſeparate conſideration.—Indeed, as it is, the whole chain of ſubjects is ſpoken of as one doctrine; what the Romaniſts teach concerning them is called "*a* fond *thing*."

VIII. "*The Romiſh Doctrine*."—In the Article of 1552 it was, "The doctrine of the *ſchool*-authors"—"*Scholaſticorum* doctrina;"—what that was, with regard to the leading ſubject, Purgatory, has been briefly mentioned in our[m] Hiſtory. If the old expreſſion had continued, the Romaniſts might have ſaid, we do not defend the doctrines of the *Schoolmen* in every particular[n]. The preſent expreſſion confines all diſpute to the doctrines which the *Romaniſts* profeſſed, whatever thoſe were; and it denotes the degree of each doctrine *actually exiſting*; ſo that it would not avail for the Romaniſts to defend *ſome* regard for ſacred painting or ſculpture; ſome reſpect for real relics; except they could defend what actually appeared in Popiſh countries relating to one or the other, *when the Article was made*.

IX. "*Worſhipping*

[m] Sect. 11.

[n] Bellarmin profeſſes to differ from the Schoolmen about *Images*; ſee Forbes, 7. 2. 27, &c.—One might ſay, in general, that the Romaniſts have, ſince the complaints of the Reformers, endeavoured to moderate the doctrines of the Schoolmen, in expreſſion, explanation, theory; but ſo as to leave room for the *people* to be as weak and credulous as their education inclines them to be. Yet from Forbes, 7. 1. 17. we ſee, that even ſome ſchoolmen did not like *Dulia* for worſhip of Saints; becauſe men are their fellow-ſervants. Biſhop Hurd oppoſes ſolemn forms of rituals, canons, and councils, to the private writings of Romiſh Divines, On Prophecy, page 384.

IX. "*Worſhipping and adoration*;"—in Latin, "*veneratione et adoratione*;"—theſe words have by no means ſo determinate a ſenſe as to prevent all diſputes, or even to ſuggeſt one invariable idea to the mind of a thinking man. They may expreſs our regards to the Supreme Being, they would not be too ſtrong for our attentions to a ſacred human character. "Worſhip" in modern Engliſh ſeems appropriated to the ſupreme Being; but at the time the Articles were made, it ſignified merely[o] reſpect, reverence, honour: as indeed appears by the Latin word of the Article, "veneratione."—Worſhipping ſeems ſometimes to be uſed in our Engliſh bibles for the eaſtern *proſtration*, and may therefore correſpond to the expreſſion of the Council of Trent, "*procumbimus*[p]." *Adorare* ſeems to mean to addreſs any one with reſpect, and with ſome idea of obtaining a favour. Such addreſs ſeems to have been conceived to be attended with ſome bodily geſtures of a reſpectful, ſuppliant ſort: as bowing, &c.—the word was ſometimes[q] uſed for addreſſing an Heathen *God*, which would be called *prayer*; but Tacitus uſes[r] *adorare vulgum* for, to bow or cringe to the common people, as canvaſſers would do.

X. *Invocation*, ſeems to be deſiring aſſiſtance, interceſſion; though, in fact, it has occaſioned formal *worſhip*.

XI. The word "*fond*," is not modern, but the meaning of it appears ſufficiently[s] from the Latin

[o] This will appear more fully in Art. XXV. Sect. VI.

[p] Page 202, Edit. Antv. 1596, Seſſ. 25, Decretum de Invocatione, &c.

[q] Cooper's Theſaurus. [r] Ainſworth's Dictionary.

[s] I cannot help comparing *fond* with the French *fou, folle*: they ſeem to have been uſed much in the ſame way; to expreſs

Latin "*futilis*." The word occurs in the Rhemiſh Teſtament twice[t].—"*A* fond *thing*;"—in the *ſingular* number: the ſyſtem of doctrines (as before) is reckoned as *one* ſingle doctrine.

"Vainly invented," — "inanitèr confiƈta."—fooliſh and unfounded; in the eye of *reaſon*; this ſeems contradiſtinguiſhed to "grounded upon no warrant of *Scripture*."

XII. "But *rather* repugnant"—immò, which we ſhould now tranſlate *nay*—nay "rather repugnant to the word of God:" we had this word in the thirteenth[u] Article, in the ſame ſenſe.—In our Latin the expreſſion is,—"immò verbo Dei contradicit;"—in that of 1552, "imò verbo Dei *perniciosè* contradicit;" though the *Engliſh* is the ſame in both; which indeed might be the reaſon why the Convocation of 1562 left out "perniciosè:" or there might be other reaſons.

XIII. We have now gone through the Article, in the way of explanation; but it ſeems proper to mention the Popiſh diſtinƈtion between λατρεια, and δυλεια, and ὑπερδυλεια.—As alſo that between *Image* and *Idol*.—The Romaniſts, wiſhing to avoid the charge of Idolatry, have ſaid, that there are different ſorts of adoration; λατρεια is that which is

want of *underſtanding*; and want of *prudence*, and being under the influence of paſſion, not controlled by reaſon: the Council of Trent blames thoſe who hold, "*ſtultum* eſſe," to pray to Saints, Seſſ. 25, page 203, bottom.—As this Seſſion was in 1563, it might aim at the Article made in 1552: or at ſome Confeſſion of Reformers to the ſame purpoſe.

[t] More ſtrictly, the word *fond* occurs in *Fulke* on the Rhemiſh Teſtament, folio, 224. I ſay *folio*, as only every other page is numbered.

[u] Art. XIII. Sect. XV.—Biſhop Hallifax has expreſſed the ſame thing in his eleventh Sermon on Prophecy. "All the obſervances mentioned here are not only not commanded in ſcripture, but are in direƈt violation of it." Page 351.

is due to God; δουλεια that which is due to man; ὑπερδουλεια that which is due to Chriſt in his human nature, or to his Mother, the bleſſed *Virgin*.—Auguſtin has ſomething of the diſtinction between λατρεια and δουλεια, and uſes *ſervitus* often; but he does not mention ὑπερδουλεια, nor is it in any Greek Author. Auguſtin was a Latin Father, and might know but little of the Greek language. I do not ſee any foundation for the diſtinction between λατρεια and δουλεια, except that λατρεια is more frequently uſed for *ſerving* God than δουλεια. Λατρις is a ſervant, and Δουλος is a ſervant.—I ſhould gueſs, that the Λατρις was more ingenuous than the Δουλος, but they, or their derivatives ſeem to be uſed interchangeably[x]: and ſometimes in ſcripture λατρευειν is uſed for ſerving[y] *men*, and δουλευειν for ſerving[z] God. But it is proper to mention in what ſenſes the Romaniſts uſe theſe words, whether they be right or wrong.

With the ſame view, of avoiding the charge of Idolatry, the Romaniſts blame us for not making diſtinction enough between *Image* and *Idol*; between εικων, I ſuppoſe, or *ſimulacrum*, (the word of the Vulgate,) and ειδωλον. It ſeems the Engliſh Teſtament had once, inſtead of "Little children keep yourſelves from[a] *Idols*,"—little children keep yourſelves from *Images*[b].—Ειδωλον in Greek ſeems to

[x] Compare Rom. i. 25. with Gal. iv. 8—Compare alſo the ſayings of Tigranes and his wife, in the third Book of Xenophon's Cyropædia, page 144. 147, 8vo.—Forbes, 7. 1. mentions them, from Valla, and has more on the ſubject.

[y] Deut. xxviii. 48.——Lev. xxiii. 7, 8.——Exod. xii. 16.——Εργον λατρευτον.

[z] Matt. vi. 24.—Rom. vi. 22.—See particularly 1 Theſſ. i. 9. in the Greek.

[a] Concluſion of 1 John.

[b] See Rhemiſts on the paſſage.

to be uſed for any reſemblance[c] or effigy; but *Idol*, in Engliſh, does ſeem to mean a viſible object, which has divine *worſhip* paid to it: the authors of the Rhemiſh Teſtament ſay[d] thus, "*neither every idol is an image, nor every image an Idol.*" That every image, or reſemblance, is not an idol, that is, not worſhipped, is clear enough; as well as that an image *may* be an Idol: the ſecond commandment forbids making a graven *image*, or the *likeneſs* of any being[e], in order to *bow down* to it, or *ſerve* it. But I feel ſome doubt whether all idols are not *made* for images, that is, reſemblances, even though they have no original really exiſting; there is no ſuch animal as a *Dragon*, yet thoſe who made the *Idol* called by that[f] name, might have ſome rude belief that there was ſuch an animal.

Peter Lombard (from Origen)[g] ſeems to make an *Idol* the copy of ſomething only *fancied*; an *image* he underſtands to be a reſemblance of ſomething *real*: according to this, no image could be called an Idol.—The LXX ſays, και ποιησεις σεαυτῳ ειδωλον, και παντος ὁμοιωμα—if here the ειδωλον is one thing, and the ὁμοιωμα another, (which does not ſeem to me the meaning) then again a *likeneſs* cannot be called an *Idol*. Yet, in cuſtomary ſpeech, any ſubſtance ſeems to be called an Idol, which is an object of religious *worſhip*[h]: but in whatever ſenſe we take the words, theſe obſervations will have the ſame tendency to cut off

[c] Or a Ghoſt: ſee Greek Primitives under ειδω.
[d] On the ſame place, 1 John v. 21.
[e] Exod. xx. 4, 5.
[f] Apocrypha.
[g] Lib. 3. diſt. 37, B.
[h] See alſo abridgment of H. Stephens, under Ειδωλον. In Stephens himſelf this is the *Eccleſiaſtical* ſenſe: there are inſtances of Ειδωλον and Εικων being uſed as ſynonymous.

off diſputes, and to prevent the Romaniſts from blaming us.

XIV. We come now to *Proof*.—This might afford us a number of propoſitions if we carried it to its utmoſt length: for we ſhould then have to ſhew, that the Syſtem of Doctrines here mentioned, is not founded on reaſon; that every text of Scripture produced in its ſupport is invalid, and then, that ſome texts of Scripture are repugnant to it: and this we ſhould have to ſhew alſo of the five particulars; Purgatory, Indulgences, Worſhip of Images, Worſhip of Relics, and Invocation of Saints. We will be as brief as poſſible.

XV. Firſt, concerning the Article *in general*. —'The *ſet* of doctrines condemned in it, are not, on a *general* view, founded in Reaſon, or warranted by Scripture.'

When Religion poſſeſſes the mind, ſo that the devout affections are ſtrong, they are apt, if not very carefully regulated, to draw the mind imperceptibly into folly and abſurdity. For a while ſuch folly may be encouraged; but ere long, it will be lamented, by every wiſe and diſintereſted perſon. A good man muſt indeed venerate, in ſome degree, every thing that ſprings from Religion, even to its very faults; he therefore will not reſtrain even what he cannot approve; nay, he is afraid to deſtroy religious principles, though erroneous. But when we may judge freely we ſee, that ſuch folly is a more important evil than ſome men think it. When it conſiſts in taking preſumptions for facts, and acting upon them, we can ſee, that it is nothing leſs than man's taking upon him to be the Author of Revelation; which may produce any evils whatever. When it conſiſts in forming acts of affection into a ſyſtem of

religious ordinances, we can ſee, that the effuſions of our beſt paſſions, though not condemned at the moment, naturally excite an ingenuous ſhame on a calm review, and are much too frivolous to be collected into a *Code*, and made *Duties*: though, in ſome caſes, their frivolouſneſs can be better felt than demonſtrated.—When religious folly conſiſts in enlivening the affections towards inviſible objects by the uſe of viſible repreſentations of them, we can ſee, that the attention gets more and more fixed on what meets the ſenſes, and continually more detached from that which is inviſible; till the judgment is perverted, and the mind debaſed. That Chriſtians ſhould be *Anthropomorphites* without ſuch imitations, may ſurpriſe us; but we ſee plainly, that all attempts to enliven devotion by their means, have a ſtrong tendency to confound the ideas of God and Man in the human mind.

Laſtly, When religious folly conſiſts in unreſerved dependence on the power of an intereſted Prieſt to puniſh or forgive, we can ſee, that what might have been a reaſonable ground of hope and confidence to a dejected penitent, becomes a temptation to ſin.

Theſe obſervations are calculated to ſhew, that the *ſet* of doctrines before us, conſidered in a general view, are not founded in *reaſon*; we are next to ſhew, that they are not warranted by *ſcripture*.—We find ſeveral paſſages of Holy writ which ſhew a kind of jealouſy of what men might call *improving* upon Chriſtianity.—As 1 Cor. iii. 12.—2 Cor. xi. 3.—Gal. i. 8, 9.—Eph. iv. 14.—Col. ii. 8.—2 Tim. i. 13. or Jude 3.—and Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

And I ſeem to ſee many paſſages, which intimate, that human appointments may be carried ſo far

far as to diſappoint their own purpoſes. — As Matt. xv. 1—9.[i] — Jewiſh ordinances ſeemed, probably, *improvements*, at the time they were made.

And particularly we find paſſages which might guard us againſt making our Chriſtian *worſhip* to be performed in any way by means of the *ſenſes*.— John iv. 24.—Gal. iii. 3.[k]

I ſuppoſe, that if the Jews had made a ſtatue[l] of Moſes, and, uſing ſolemn geſtures before that, had invoked Moſes, and deſired him once[m] more to mediate between God and them, they would have broken the ſecond commandment. It ſeems probable that they were forbidden to make to themſelves the likeneſs of anything in Heaven or Earth, becauſe it would gradually have diſpoſed their minds to idolatry.

XVI. From theſe general proofs of the Article, we paſs on to ſome more *particular*.—And firſt of *Purgatory*. That there is ſuch a ſtate of purification, by ſuffering, after death, appears inadmiſſible, becauſe it ſeems unreaſonable that we ſhould be expected to allow what is wholly paſſed over when it was moſt likely to be noticed. In Matt. xxv. we have only two ſtates mentioned, and they were both "prepared" without any hint of any temporary

[i] Art. VII. Sect. IV. one might alſo conſider Art. XIV. about *will-worſhip*. Biſhop Hurd, Proph. page 393, ſpeaks of Will-worſhip as an opprobrious name: not ſo Dr Hammond.

[k] Thoſe who took Notes at Lecture ſhould be informed, that ſome texts in this Section were omitted for want of time; and the whole of Sect. 13th by miſtake.

[l] The Melchiſedecians are ſaid to have had a ſtatue of Moſes, in Arabia, and to have worſhipped it. Epiphan. Hær. 55.— Rhem. Teſt. on Heb. ix. Sect. 4. Fulke.

[m] Exod. xxxii. 11. 32.—Numb. xvi. 22. 46, &c.—See alſo Deut. v. 5. and Lev. xxvi. 46. though the two laſt relate only to mediation concerning the law.

temporary ſufferings to the "bleſſed."—The ſame might be obſerved of other paſſages.—If ſuch a ſtate as Purgatory is to be allowed by all men, is it not unaccountable, that Chriſtians ſhould have been ſo long ignorant[n] of it? Its being admitted at laſt may be accounted for, from the notions of the ancients, from its ſuiting the wiſhes and alleviating the fears of the People, and from its being lucrative to the ſacred orders.

In order to prove that Purgatory is "grounded on no warrant of *ſcripture*," one ſhould examine all the texts alledged in ſupport of it: this would be what we have called indirect proof. Theſe texts (out of the *New* Teſtament) may be found in the *Rhemiſh* Teſtament, and all in *Veneer*[o] on this Article. But they ſeem to me to have ſo little weight, that I may ſafely venture to omit them, referring to Biſhop Porteus[p] for a ſpecimen.—Indeed ſome of them have been explained, in our diſcuſſions, or in Biſhop Pearſon on the Deſcent into Hell.

The laſt thing, with regard to Purgatory is to ſhew, that the notion of it is "*repugnant* to the word of God."—This we ſhould call direct proof; the negative form of the Article makes here a trifling difference.

Now under the the twelfth Article it was ſhewn, that what are popularly called the good actions of

[n] See a paſſage from Biſhop Fiſher at the concluſion of this Article.

[o] Texts for Purgatory copied from Veneer, page 460. on this article; only the order changed: ſome ſeem to be falſe prints.—Exod. i. 15.—Numb. xiv. 32, 33.—1 Sam. iii.—2 Kings i.—Pſalm lxvi. 12.—Iſaiah ix. 18.—Mich. vii. 8, 9.—Zech. ix. 11.—Mal. iii. 3.—Matt. v. 22.—v. 25, 26.—xii. 32. Luke xxxii. 42. (qu. 22?)—Acts ii. 24.—1 Cor. iii. 15.—xv. 29.—Phil. ii. 10.—James ii. 25. (qu. 13?)—1 Pet. iii 19.—1 John v. 16.

[p] Biſhop Porteus, page 48.

of a Chriſtian, though imperfect, are "pleaſing and acceptable to God, in Chriſt." If ſo, there is no need of *ſuffering*. — That our forgiveneſs through Chriſt is *immediate*, the ſcriptures[q] declare; as is ſhewn by Biſhop Burnet on this Article. —I will therefore conclude my proof with 1 John i. 7.—"the blood of Jeſus Chriſt"—"cleanſeth us from *all* ſin."

XVII. In the next place we ſhould prove, of the Doctrine of *Pardons*, or Indulgences, that it is unfounded in reaſon, and has no warrant of ſcripture, but is even repugnant to it.

In the way of reaſoning, it appears, that the doctrine of Pardons is groundleſs, becauſe their buſineſs is to diſpenſe the Treaſures of merits amaſſed by works of *ſupererogation*; whereas under the fourteenth Article it was ſhewn, that there are no ſuch works, and, of conſequence, no ſuch treaſures to diſpenſe. The effect alſo of Indulgences is to relieve ſouls out of *Purgatory*; whereas we have juſt now ſhewn, that the exiſtence of ſuch a ſtate is not admiſſible.

This doctrine is not warranted by Scripture, becauſe the paſſages alledged in its ſupport[r] are only thoſe, as I conceive, which appoint the Governors of the Church to be the *Agents* of Chriſt: now all appointments of Agents muſt be underſtood with this limitation, ſo long as they act in the *Character* of Agents. If an Agent undeniably and groſsly exceeds his Commiſſion, his principal is never obliged to ratify his acts.—Being the Agent of God for the ſake of conducting religious ſociety, does not make Man to be God; any more than an Embaſſy makes an Embaſſador to be a Sovereign.

This

[q] Heb. ix. 27.
[r] Matt. xvi. 19.—John xx. 23.

This doctrine is repugnant to 2 Theſſ. ii. 4. without conſidering that paſſage as predictive of Popery. Whatever ſtate it foretells, that ſtate is a wrong one.

XVIII. The next ſubject which occurs, is the worſhipping of *Images*. And firſt we ſhould reaſon on the ſubject, in order to ſee whether it has any foundation: But ſomething has been already[s] ſaid on the effect of Images on the mind: the uſe of them has been ſhewn to be attended with danger of debaſing our religious ſentiments and principles. Diſputes relating to the uſe of them are kept up by the various degree of Adoration: but our Article takes the degree actually *ſubſiſting* at the time it was made; this was *cultus religioſus*; to which our former obſervations are applicable. —The only forcible argument for the uſe of Images ſeems to be, that which is contained in the favourite expreſſion, 'Images and Pictures are the *Books*[t] *of the unlearned*.'—And it is true, that delineations are leſs arbitrary than words, ſtrike more quickly, convey ideas to more perſons; more eaſily ſeize a[u] reluctant attention. No one will hear me ſpeak anything but praiſe of Macklin's Bible,

[s] Sect. IV. and XIV.

[t] Rhem. Teſt. on John v. 21.—Comber, in his advice to Engl. Papiſts, page 85, quotes this as a ſaying of "Porphyr. apud Euſeb. Præpar. Evang. lib. 3."

[u] Mr. Collier, once High Sheriff of the Iſle of Ely, told me, that, in order to get the Jail at Ely repaired, he had preſented to the Privy Council *drawings* of the Priſoners, loaded with more Irons, &c. than would have been needful to ſecure them, had the Jail been properly repaired; and expreſſing their feelings by their countenances and attitudes: without this meaſure he had deſpaired of gaining the attention of the Privy Council at that time. It was doubtful whether, the Biſhop of Ely was obliged to keep the Jail in repair. The ſcheme, I have underſtood, produced an early deciſion from the Privy Council, to the great alleviation of the ſufferings of thoſe under confinement at that place.

Bible, or of the charming weſt window at New College Chapel; I am ſure any reaſonable Proteſtant may receive good from the contemplation of them: but then it is, becauſe they have not the leaſt connexion, in his mind, with *Worſhip*. The *Papiſts* uſe reſemblances as *media* in the very *act* of worſhipping. If I was called upon to gaze upon the beſt ſtatue or picture in the world, as the means of heightening my *devotion* in prayer, I ſhould turn aſide from it: a *weſt* window cannot well be intended for ſuch a purpoſe.—Take then the books of the unlearned into their proper place, and there they may be ſtudied with profit, and without danger.

I am happy to find *Auguſtin* expreſſing himſelf in the manner he does, on this ſubject.—"Et Idola quidèm omni ſenſu carere quis dubitet? Verûm tamen cum his locantur ſedibus, honorabili ſublimitate, ut a precantibus atque immolantibus attendantur, ipsâ ſimilitudine animatorum membrorum atque ſenſuum, quamvis inſenſata et exanima, afficiunt infirmos animos, ut vivere et ſpirare videantur: accedente præſertìm veneratione multitudinis, quâ tantus eis cultus impenditur[x]." This paſſage finely deſcribes the bad tendency of Images when uſed as media in worſhip, and would be an anſwer to all that is urged by the Papiſts about the people being *taught* that there is no Divinity[y] in them, nor any truſt to be placed in them; even ſuppoſe no adoration paid them which could properly be called religious.

The

[x] Auguſt. Ep. 102. al. 49. (Sid. Y—1—1. page 212.) note 18. In anſwer to ſix queſtions from Pagans, this is the third; about aboliſhing rites.—It is commended by Lardner: Works, Vol. 8, page 239, note.—It gives one a good idea of the converſion of Pagans to Chriſtianity; I mean, that their converſion was made on good grounds.

[y] Trent, Seſſ. 25,—See alſo Rhem. Teſt. on Acts xvii. 29.

The Romaniſts betray a conſciouſneſs of ſomething wrong with reſpect to the worſhip of Images, by leaving the ſecond commandment out of the Decalogue. This was mentioned under the ſeventh Article[z].

Nor is there any warrant in Scripture for worſhipping Images, in any ſenſe: the only paſſage urged which ſeems at all worth mentioning, is that in the Book of Exodus[a], where God commands Moſes to make ſome forms called *Cherubims* on the Mercy-ſeat: but theſe were not (as far as is known to Man) Images, but *Emblems*[b]: there was no danger of the People's worſhipping them, becauſe the people never came into the place where they were; and the High Prieſt only once a year.—Jehovah never bound *himſelf* to order nothing ſenſible to be uſed in the Jewiſh worſhip, he only ſaid, "*thou* ſhalt not make unto thee any graven Image."—Even under Chriſtianity, water, bread, wine, all objects of the ſenſes, are uſed in worſhip; all emblematically, but they are not objects of worſhip; neither do they contain any *likeneſs* of any thing in heaven or in earth.

Thirdly, the worſhip of Images may be ſaid to be even repugnant to ſcripture. It ſeems indeed as if the ſacred writers could not poſſibly have the preciſe caſe of Popiſh Images before them; and therefore we can only reaſon and infer from ſcriptures intended for caſes of like nature; but Deut. xxvii. 15. and Pſalm xcvii. 7. ſhould not be of leſs force under Chriſtianity than under Judaiſm. They do indeed ſpeak of the Idols of Heathens, immediately; but whether Romiſh worſhip of Images

[z] Art. VII. Sect. XIII. end.

[a] Exod. xxv. 18.

[b] Parkhurſt, Hebr. Lex. כרב, may make the Cherubims to be thought emblems, even by thoſe who do not come into every idea of his.

Images be Idolatry or not, the progreſs of the mind from worſhipping the inviſible object, to worſhipping the viſible image, is ſo much the ſame, whatever be the reſemblance, or its original, that every prohibition of worſhipping images, ſhould be conſidered as reaching every caſe in which a reſemblance has anything to do with religious worſhip. If this be juſt, worſhip of Images is, at leaſt, diſcouraged, by a great number of paſſages in the Old Teſtament.

In Deut. iv. 12. 15. particularly ver. 16. Jehovah ſeems to let us into the *grounds* of his prohibitions; and they muſt be always of force: thoſe who make a likeneſs of anything, are ſaid ver. 16. to *corrupt themſelves*.

And with regard to the *New Teſtament*, St. Paul's reaſoning with the *Athenians*[c] ſeems to imply, that Chriſtians ought not, now that times of ignorance are paſt, to make uſe of any ſenſible *media* in worſhip, though to an inviſible or "*unknown* God;" that uſing ſuch is not doing all we can to worſhip God in Spirit:—we may alſo obſerve, that whatever only tends to make us change "the Glory of the incorruptible God into an image," or worſhip "the creature[d] more than the Creator," is carefully to be avoided, even on ſcriptural authority; nay, on the authority of the New Teſtament.

XIX. The next ſubject is that of worſhipping *Relics*. In the degree in which it prevails its futility is palpable, and its tendency to promote infidelity has been mentioned[e]. Whatever aſſociates Chriſtianity with contempt, has ſome effect in making Chriſtianity contemptible. It ſeems *Calvin*

[c] Acts xvii.
[d] Rom. i. 23, 25.
[e] Sect. v.

Calvin[f] propoſed that an *Inventory* ſhould be publiſhed of Popiſh relics: no propoſal can be more fair: ſuch inventory would be all the proof we could want, that "the Romiſh Doctrine" "is a fond thing."

The Romiſh doctrine about Relics is not warranted by Scripture.—One text alledged is Matt. ix. 22. but the woman cured did not *adore* the hem of our Saviour's garment; ſhe thought nothing about it; nor was ſhe cured by virtue of any relic; her *Faith* made her whole.

Another text is Acts xix. 12. there is a great eagerneſs deſcribed to get handkerchieſs, &c. from St. Paul; it ſhewed Faith, or an high opinion of his ſupernatural power. It might be weak, though natural; it might ſucceed, on account of the diſpoſition which it implied; and yet ſuch a flight might not be meant as the ground of a perpetual obſervance: to *copy* ſuch things is ſilly and childiſh. —That Paul ſhould perform miracles on thoſe who were at a diſtance from him, rather ſurprizes us at firſt: but if God thought fit that it ſhould be ſo, diſtance probably would occaſion no additional difficulty; and we can conceive, that ſuch diſtance would ſtrengthen the evidence in ſome reſpects; and then it ſeems probable, from a compariſon with our Saviour's mode of performing miraculous cures, that the cure would be connected with the perſon who performed it, by ſome viſible[g] tokens. At preſent *we* believe that miracles have ceaſed.—Another text is Heb. ix. 4. but the things laid up in that caſe were *records*; reaſon and divine authority conſpired in dictating that they ſhould be preſerved.

[f] See Fulke on Rhem. Teſt Acts xix. 12. folio, 221, from "Calvin's admonition concerning Reliques."

[g] Mark vii. 33.

preſerved.—And the genuineneſs of the relics is indiſputable. I do not ſuppoſe that the *Jews* pretend to any relics *now*. If they did, and worſhipped them, the caſe would be a caſe in point. —The care ſhewn in ſcripture to give decent *burial*, to our Lord, St. Stephen, &c. will not, I truſt, convert any one to the Romiſh doctrine of Relics.

As to its being repugnant to ſcripture, I will content myſelf with ſaying, that the texts brought to prove the doctrine of *Images* ſo, may be applied in ſuch a manner as to be ſufficient for any one's conviction.—Saint Paul would probably have ſaid of this error as he does of ſome others, had he been witneſs of it; "refuſe profane and old wives fables," and exerciſe "thyſelf rather[i] unto godlineſs."

xx. The laſt part of our Proof relates to Invocation of *Saints*. That it is fooliſh, in the degree in which we ſpeak of it, (according to what was ſaid in the hiſtorical part and explanation,) appears from the endeavours of the Romaniſts to explain[k] it away.

Saints cannot hear all who invoke them; this has been obſerved before. As to the notion that the Angels[l] employ themſelves in *informing* the Saints of what good Catholics addreſs to them, I dare ſay you will excuſe me if I do not attempt to diſprove it: it proves to me, that the doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, wants ſupport[m].

Experience,

[i] 1 Tim. iv. 7.

[k] Compare Midd. Preface, page 50, with page 156 of his Letter, and many other parts.—And ſee *Boſſuet*, quoted by Biſhop Hurd, Proph. page 386.

[l] End of Sect. VI. from Forbes, 7. 1. 21.

[m] I think Epiphanius's reaſoning about the *Virgin*, is well worth mentioning: Ει γαρ Αγγελως προσκυνεισθαι ο θελει (θεος), πολυ

Experience, I think, will ſhew, that the lower the objects of our religious addreſſes are, the lower will be the turn of our religious ſentiments: and the leſs will they be directed to the all-perfect Being. We may ſay of the Invocation of Saints as of Purgatory, that its being admitted, can be accounted for, without ſuppoſing it to be well founded.

In the next place, the Doctrine of the Invocation of Saints is not warranted by Scripture. Origen thought it poſſible, that[n] "ſome will be redeemed by the blood of Martyrs." This does not certainly imply the invocation of them; but it is contrary to an obſervation of our own in a preceding[o] Article.—The texts in favour of our preſent doctrine are much of the ſame ſtamp with thoſe for that of Purgatory; and I ſhall beg leave to uſe the ſame method[p] with them all, except thoſe which direct men to intercede for each other, as 1 Theſſ. v. 25.—1 Tim. ii. 1. and James v. 16. —Now it being allowed, from theſe, and others, that man ought to intercede for men; and that one man may deſire, or call upon another to do ſo; is it not to be believed, that Saints in Heaven intercede for men, and that men may invoke them in order to beg their Interceſſion? Biſhop Hurd has thought this objection worthy of a very attentive conſideration, and he has anſwered it at length in his eleventh Sermon[q] on Prophecy. Biſhop Porteus

πoσῳ μαλλον την απο Αννης γεγενημενον; Hær. 79. (Collyridians) Sect. v.——In Sect. vii. he ſays, Την Μαριαν μηδεις προσκυνειτω: and near the end of the Hær. ἡ Μαρια εν τιμῃ, ὁ Κυριος προσκυνεισθω.

n Lardner's Works, Vol. 2, page 462.

o Appendix to Art. xi. Sect. iv.

p A ſpecimen collected from Rhem. Teſt.——Luke xvi. 9.—Acts v. 15.—vii. 60.—2 Cor. i. 11.—2 Pet. i. 15.—1 John ii. 1. ——Apoc. v. 8.——vi. 10.

q Hurd on Prophecy, page 386, &c.

Porteus has anſwered it briefly[r] according to his plan. I would wiſh you to read theſe anſwers, and therefore I will only ſay, if we may conclude, that Saints are incapable of hearing our Invocations, the whole buſineſs is at an end: If that be not allowed, I then reaſon thus; our not being told that we are to promote Interceſſion among Saints in Heaven, when we are repeatedly told that we are to promote it on[s] earth, ſeems a ſtrong argument that no ſuch thing is expected of us, or proper for us. Still if men are determined to perſiſt, and ſay that they can reaſon by Analogy from earth to heaven, the proper analogy ſeems to me to be this; as Chriſtians are required to intercede for each other on earth, ſo it is probable that Saints and Angels intercede for each other in heaven: and this notion is confirmed by reaſons of utility. It is certainly very uſeful, in a moral light, that men ſhould intercede for each[t] other: it improves the mind of each Interceſſor, it promotes mutually beneficent principles, which effect the general good: beſides that placing our benevolence before God, viewing it in the light of his countenance, muſt needs make it of a right ſort. But the interceſſion of one rank for another, has not the ſame effects; nor can frail ignorant men on earth give their attention to creatures in heaven, in a ſtate quite out of the reach of their knowledge without great danger of a romantic, and ſuperſtitious religion.

I will now proceed to the laſt thing in our Proof; to ſhew, that the Romiſh Doctrine of the Invocation of Saints, is even repugnant, in ſome degree,

[r] Biſhop Porteus's Brief Confutation, page 23.
[s] Conſider Matt. xviii. 19. in this view.
[t] Dr. Ogden on Prayer and Interceſſion treats this ſubject.

degree, to the Scripture. It does not ſeem that the ſacred writers had, or could have, the doctrine immediately in their view, and therefore there may be no indirect prohibition of it made in ſo many words; but the ſilence being on both ſides, is much in our favour: if nothing be ſaid, there is nothing to be done. Eſpecially when we are told, that we may ourſelves[u] uſe importunity with our heavenly Lord. The heavenly creatures are called our fellow-ſervants, Rev. xix. 10. and xxii. 9. and elſewhere.

The Romaniſts have indeed ſaid, that *Dulia* is nevertheleſs due to them, from Gal. v. 13. but the δουλεια there mentioned is clearly mutual; and indeed means only mutual kind offices; δια της αγαπης.

Biſhop Hurd[x] conſiders, after Mede, the Romaniſts as guilty of the Dæmon-worſhip mentioned 1 Tim. iv. 1.—And Biſhop Hallifax[y], after Mr. Mede and Biſhop Newton, applies to them Dan. xi. 38. according to the marginal reading: Mahuzzim (מעזים[z]) being interpreted Protectors, or tutelary Deities, and conſidered as including Saints and Angels.—The texts of the New Teſtament would have an immediate reference to the oriental philoſophy, and the ſpiritual Beings which it ſuppoſed; as was ſhewn at the end of the firſt Book: but from thoſe texts we may form a tolerable judgment what the Apoſtles would have ſaid about the Popiſh Saints. This ſeems the proper idea with which we ſhould read Col. ii. 18. 23.—1 Tim.

[u] Matt. vii. 7.—Luke xi. 8, 9.

[x] On Prophecy, page 386.

[y] On Prophecy, page 352.

[z] From מעז, or עזז: Parkhurſt's account is under עז. In Walton's Polyglott the word is not interpreted. Lowth, on the place, prefers Mede's tranſlation.

1 Tim. i. 4. and iv. 1, &c[a].—I conclude with 1 Tim. ii. 5. "There is one God, and one mediator between God and Man, the Man Jesus Christ."

XXI. If we say anything in the way of *Application*, it shall be concerning the *mutual concessions* which might be conceived to take place, supposing the contending parties were perfectly candid: indeed from mutual concessions must of course arise *improvements*. I always wish, whilst I am engaged in controversy, that some respectable adversary were present; in order that personal respect might prevent anything illiberal from being thrown out.

It has not been sufficiently observed in the controversies on this Article, that he who refuses to admit a doctrine, does not of course deny it. It may be wrong, in some cases, either to adopt or reject a[b] notion. A man says, you will allow that the Planets are inhabited; the proper answer is, I neither allow it nor deny it. It seems probable from analogy that they may be; and I should think any man narrow-minded who made himself sure that they were not; but the moment you build anything upon such a supposition, I declare your building to be without foundation. We say indeed that Purgatory, &c. are repugnant to Scripture; but we do not mean, to any express declaration belonging immediately to the doctrine. —This might possibly have some effect in reconciling: would *Dupin* have been content with saying, it *may* be needful for our souls to be purified after death? and would our Church say the same? —Might it be said, the Saints in Heaven may possibly

[a] Col. ii. 23. will occur again under Art. XXXII.—Indeed it has already occurred.

[b] Art. XVIII. Sect. IX.

poſſibly know ſomething of our actions? this would have effect.—What elſe do we ſay of particular judgments of God?—How do I know but this event may be a judgment? Such a queſtion is enough to make us think; and to learn righteouſneſs; more would be preſumption and ſuperſtition.

It ſeems, at firſt, a ſtrange thing to have the rituals, canons, councils[c], of a Church, ſo different from "the private writings of her Divines," as we find them in the Church of Rome: but this may perhaps be nothing more than that ſome Romaniſts are more improved than others: that the ignorant people go on in the old track, which was firſt made in times of darkneſs and ſuperſtition, and that the enlightened, though they dare not diſturb the minds of the lower people, endeavour, in their own perſons, to make the old doctrines as little abſurd as poſſible; and endeavour to dwell on what is right, and ſoften what is wrong.

In our church many a Pariſh Clerk has readings and cuſtoms which we cannot juſtify, though we let him go on: and the common people have ſuperſtitions which are not the Doctrine of our Church: our church was formed by the beſt and ableſt of men, at the revival of learning; and conſiſted of reformations of abuſes, as far as it differed from all others: and all its members who are tolerably educated, muſt be upon much the ſame footing.

Now if this be the caſe, many popiſh errors will diſappear as the people improve; and the Fire of Purgatory will gradually go out. Even Councils, Canons and Rituals, may grow obſolete, and at

[c] Hurd on Prophecy, page 348.

at laſt "vaniſh[d] away."—We may hope to ſee this improvement take place firſt in our Countrymen of the Romiſh perſuaſion.

A change might, in caſe of improvement, take place particularly in what is called *Adoration*. The ceremonies of bowing, kiſſing things animate and inanimate, and even of kneeling[e], are arbitrary, in a great degree. At this time, or at any other, I ſuppoſe Engliſh Papiſts might not uſe all the ſame geſtures with Italians, though equally ſuperſtitious, before Images and pictures.

It has been[f] ſaid, that no reconciliation need be attempted between Papiſts and Proteſtants in thoſe doctrines which are the occaſions of accumulating wealth: but the Clergy are by no means ſo corrupt as they uſed to be; and the Pope raiſes much leſs from his followers than formerly.—I do not think that the God of this world has ſo blinded the minds (2 Cor. iv. 4.) of Engliſhmen, Proteſtants, or Catholics, as to make them perſiſt long in errors merely becauſe they are lucrative.

As Biſhop Fiſher confirms, in an artleſs way, ſeveral things which we have had occaſion to obſerve, I will tranſcribe a paſſage from his refutation of Luther[g].

"Multos fortaſſe movet *Indulgentiis* iſtis non uſque adeò fidere, quòd eorum uſus in Eccleſiâ videatur *recentior*, et admodùm ſerò apud Chriſtianos repertus: quibus ego reſpondeo, non certò conſtare a quo primùm tradi cœperint: fuit tamen *nonnullus* earum uſus, ut aiunt, apud Romanos vetuſtiſſimus, quod ex ſtationibus[h] intelligi poteſt:"

And

[d] Heb viii. 13.

[e] One of the Canons of the Council of Nice forbids, I think, kneeling at Prayer.

[f] Art. XIV. Sect. VII.

[g] Art. XVIII. (page 496.) in Forbes 12. 8. 31.

[h] There is ſomething about *ſtations* in Bingham, 13. 9. 2. and Forbes 12. 8. 14.

And he adds, " Nemo certè dubitat orthodoxus an *Purgatorium* ſit, de quo tamen *apud priſcos nulla, vel quàm rariſſima, fiebat mentio:* ſed et *Græcis* ad hunc uſque Diem non eſt creditum *eſſe:* quamdiù enim nulla fuerat de Purgatorio cura, nemo quæſivit *Indulgentias*; nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum exiſtimatio: *ſi tollas Purgatorium quorsùm indulgentiis opus erit?* cæperunt igitur indulgentiæ poſtquam ad Purgatorii cruciatus aliquamdiù trepidatum eſt."

Biſhop Fiſher was Chancellor of this Univerſity, Preceptor to Henry VIII. a principal writer againſt Luther, a Cardinal, and Biſhop of Rocheſter: he choſe rather to ſuffer death, than to permit any one but the Pope, to make him Archbiſhop of Canterbury.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXIII.

OF MINISTERING IN THE CONGREGATION.

IT is not lawful for any man to take upon him the office of publick preaching, or miniſtering the Sacraments in the congregation, before he be lawfully called, and ſent to execute the ſame. And thoſe we ought to judge lawfully called and ſent, which be choſen and called to this work by Men who have publick authority given unto them in the congregation, to call and ſend miniſters into the Lord's vineyard.

1. It ſeems needful even for the purpoſe of offering our hiſtorical reflexions, to conſider firſt, in what "miniſtering" conſiſts. In "preaching," baptizing, preſiding at the Lord's ſupper: theſe are all particulars mentioned in our Article; but yet we uſually include reading prayers, or praying, marrying, and burying.—So that to mention any of theſe occaſionally, will not be thought beyond our purpoſe. Indeed the Sacraments are treated of in the following Articles; therefore we muſt endeavour to ſay nothing of them here, which may with more propriety be introduced hereafter.

Our ſubject is, the obligation which Chriſtians are under to take *Orders* before they perform any public act of an eccleſiaſtical Miniſter; or, as it is ſomewhere expreſſed, not to do any ſuch act "*ſelf-ordered.*"

In reviewing *hiſtorical* facts, we muſt paſs over the conduct of the Apoſtles and other inſpired men; becauſe that will make part of our *Proof*.

II. The *Apoſtolic Fathers* ſpeak conſtantly as if thoſe who miniſtered had received a regular commiſſion to miniſter. *Clement* of Rome, in his firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, a work always held genuine, is what I ſhould call copious on the ſubject of Miniſters; not proving anything formally about their commiſſion, but taking it for granted. —One ſees from this work, that the Corinthian Church had *ejected* ſome miniſters; for which he blames them.—*Polycarp* ſpeaks of the *qualifications* of good Miniſters: he mentions alſo Valens's having been diſmiſſed from the Preſbytery. He writes to the *Philippians*.—*Ignatius*, writing to the Church at *Epheſus*, ſpeaks of that Church as very *well governed*; and ſays a good deal on the ſubject of *Epiſcopal* authority. And to the Church of *Smyrna* he ſays,

Εκεινη βεβαια Ευχαριστια ἡγεισθω, ἡ ὑπο του επισκοπου ἒσα, ἡ ᾧ ἂν αυτος επιτρεψῃ.

To which we may add, that the diſtinction between Clergy and *Laity* (Κληρος and Λαϊκοι) was known in the time of Clemens[a] Romanus, and expreſſed in the ſame words in which it has been expreſſed ever ſince.

The *continuance* of a regularly appointed Clergy appears undeniably from the *Roman Laws* concerning them. Concerning their *Revenues*, ariſing from various ſucceſſions, contributions, &c.—their peculiar *puniſhments*, and the modes of life and *employments* which were permitted them; of all theſe *Bingham* gives an account, in the fifth, ſixth, and ſeventeenth Books of his Antiquities.

III. Things

[a] Bingham's Antiquities, Clem. ad Cor. 1. 5. end of Sect. xlii. ὁ λαϊκος ανθρωπος τοις λαϊκοις προσαγμασιν δεδιται.

III. Things ſeem to have gone on in much the ſame train, with ſome exceptions which need not be mentioned, till the *twelfth Century*. Then the corruptions prevailing in the Church, began to ſet ſome men of good minds and ſimple manners, upon ſeparating from the main body of their Chriſtian Brethren. Theſe were called *Waldenſes:* they lived in the Mountainous country of Piedmont, bordering upon France; in the *Vaudois*[b]; and ſeem to have had chiefly in view to bring back the Church of Chriſt to its *primitive ſimplicity*. In order to do that they would have a great deal of church power to prune away; and ſo it is ſaid that they held, that any man might, in ſome degree, exhort and expound. Yet it is alſo ſaid, that they had ſomething in the way of our three ranks; I mean of Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons. In truth, the age in which they lived, and their own obſcurity, though they were very numerous, have left many doubts concerning them. Their deſcendants ſtill remain in the ſame country, and Proteſtants have been called upon, not many years ago, to relieve them when under perſecution.

IV. At

[b] See Maclaine's Note on Moſheim's Eccleſ. Hiſt. Cent. 12. 2. 5. 11, 12. Theſe vallies were called Vaudois, on account of the Waldenſes, or Vaudois coming to inhabit them. Their head, Petrus Waldus, or *Vaud:* Cave ſays, Petrus Waldius, that is, of Waldi.——Moſheim ſays, we muſt *diſtinguiſh* carefully between Waldenſes and Vaudois; but Maclaine oppoſes this.

The Waldenſes are ſometimes called *Albigenſes*, but Moſheim makes Albigenſes to mean ſome *Paulicians*, or *Manicheans*, in the 11th Century, from *Albigia*, or Alby in France; ſee Moſh. Cent. xi. Part ii. Chap. v. Sect. ii, iii. with the Notes of Maclaine, who differs from Moſheim. When differences ariſe, relative to matters not eſſential, between perſons of character, who have ſtudied thoſe matters; we generally content ourſelves with ſtating briefly the different opinions maintained.

IV. At the time of the *Reformation*, the uſual appointments of Miniſters continued in the Church of Rome, and in the Church of England; but in ſome countries abroad, on Biſhops[c] refuſing to ordain thoſe who were ſeparating from the Romiſh Church, they had recourſe to ordination by *Elders*, or Preſbyters, which kind of ordination has continued ever ſince in thoſe countries; and was transferred from thence[d] into *Scotland* by John *Knox*.

In the Church of Rome, *Ordo* being made a Sacrament, it will occur under the twenty-fifth Article. The Romaniſts boaſt of a regular ſucceſſion of Biſhops, from St. Peter down to the preſent time; but ſome Proteſtants have conceived themſelves able to prove[e], that they had full as good a claim to ſuch an honour. The ſubject is much too complicated for us to meddle with: and may belong to the thirty-ſixth Article rather than this; or perhaps not be at all neceſſary.

V. *Socinus* found a difficulty ariſing from the Reformation: Some of his friends[f] urged, that by that event, the Church (conſidered externally, as a viſible Society) was *collapſed*, or fallen to ruins; and that no leſs power could rebuild it, than had built

[c] Heylin's Tracts, page 228.

[d] Baxter pleads for the legality of Ordination by Preſbyters; but, in ſtrictneſs, he does not ſeem to bring an inſtance of it, except in caſes of neceſſity. On Councils, page 485. Biſhop *Horne* declares againſt Ordination by Preſbyters; and maintains the neceſſity of a *ſucceſſion* of ordaining Miniſters. Charge 1791, page 23.

[e] Baxter on Councils, page 471, Sect. viii. and page 484, Prop. vi.—Burnet on the validity of Engliſh Ordinations.—Neal 1. page 502, bottom, quarto.—Heylin's Hiſtory of Epiſcopacy.—Archbiſhop *Bramhall* has a work on this ſubject, which may be good: ſee the account in his *Life*, Biogr. Britan. note (u); or his *works* in folio.

[f] Socinus's third Epiſtle to Matt. Radecius; Works, Vol. 1. fol. page 380, &c. (or Fratres Poloni) page 383, 384.

built it originally:—that is, a ſupernatural *miraculous*[g] power muſt again be diſplayed on earth, otherwiſe no man could ever have the ſatisfaction of thinking, that he was a member of the true Church of Chriſt.

This was not a notion to be born by one who was juſt eſtabliſhing a new religion, or Sect; Socinus therefore combats it ſtrenuouſly:—any aſſembly, he holds, may form themſelves into a *Church*; as to ſucceſſion, and election after any particular mode, they are nothing. Even in the time of the Apoſtles, men not admitted into Chriſtianity, and no way commiſſioned, might preach the word of their[h] own accord; much more may a Chriſtian expound now, when Chriſtianity is eſtabliſhed: general conſent is all that is wanted.

As to the *Lord's Supper*, any ſet of Chriſtians may meet and *break bread* together:—and *Baptiſm*, may be changed into any other mode of admitting one's name into the liſt of Chriſtians; or even being *brought up* by Chriſtian Parents, is ſufficient of itſelf. But Socinus does not inform his Friend *Radecius*, how all this is to be carried into *execution* with decency and order;—how competition and confuſion are to be avoided; or preſumptuous folly prevented from ſtopping the mouth of modeſt ſenſe. The ſame defect is obſervable in the Racovian Catechiſm: there, innocence of life, and fitneſs to teach, are[i] mentioned as qualifications; but it is not ſaid who is to be judge whether any particular man poſſeſſes them.

VI. The

[g] One objection to Miniſters which Baxter anſwers, is "You work no *Miracles*."—On Councils, page 472.

[h] Socinus refers here to Acts viii. 4. and xi. 19, &c.

[i] De Eccleſiâ Chriſti, cap 2, page 241.

VI. The Popiſh yoke removed, men found more liberty than they uſed to any good purpoſe. *Fanatic* teachers ſprung up, and aſſumed a variety of ſtrange forms. It is not worth while to mention every ſhort lived freak; but, taking all the time between the Reformation and the beginning of this eighteenth Century, there ſeem to be three leading ideas, beſides our own, with regard to the miniſterial office:

One, that the authority to execute it was to come immediately from heaven. Another, that it was to be given by a Senate, or Council of *Elders*, or *Preſbyters*; both theſe allowed it to extend to *ſeveral* congregations; but the third idea was, that church authority was of a confined nature, and belonged only to one *ſingle congregation*, the members of which conferred it by *Election*. —The firſt was the idea of all ſorts of *Myſtics*; of the Familiſts, or Family[k] of Love, in Queen Elizabeth's time; and afterwards of thoſe Myſtics who were called *Seekers*[l], and of the *Quakers* in the time of Oliver Cromwell.—The ſecond was the idea of the *Preſbyterians*, before[m] briefly mentioned; the third was the idea of the *Independents*, who looked upon each ſeparate Congregation as a ſeparate Church. The *Browniſts*[n], in the time of Queen Elizabeth, did not make a[o] church more extenſive; but thoſe commonly called Independents

[k] See Art. VII. Sect. III. but the *Reformatio Legum* de Hæreſibus, Cap. 16. ſhould here be read.—Some held, that any who had a ſmattering of the ſcriptures, ("qui ſacris literis utcunque ſunt aſperſi,") and ſaid they had the *Spirit*, might teach *any* where, and give Sacraments, and govern the Church; no miniſters being ſettled in any fixed places: might miniſter without any vocation, impoſition of hands, or any act of the *Church*.

[l] Baxter on Councils, page 471, Sect. x.—Alſo page 460.

[m] Sect. IV. [n] Art. VII. Sect. VI.

[o] Neal, Vol. I. page 253.

dents made no figure till the time of our civil wars[p] in the ſeventeenth Century. We are told, that they do not inſiſt upon Ordination, except for adminiſtring the Sacraments[q].—*Impoſition of hands* ſeems to have been uſed by moſt or all ſects of Chriſtians who practiſed Ordination[r]. The Preſbyterians have two *Lay-elders* for each preaching Miniſter, in the impoſition of hands, and in Synods: the Lutherans have *Superintendants* (not unlike Biſhops) who perform that Office[s].

Sometimes Fanaticiſm may confound or ſuſpend the obſervance of Rules: in the armies of Cromwell, both General and Soldiers[t] prayed and preached; but in every thing like a regular ſociety, I apprehend there is at bottom ſome *commiſſion* for performing every miniſterial office.—Wherever I ſee *Order*, I aſcribe it to *Rule*; and order in a *Society*, to *Authority*.—If this be right, thoſe who pretend to have no rule, muſt have ſome way of deceiving themſelves[u]; in common civilities people do things by Rule, which they can fancy are from the mere choice of the moment.

The Methodiſts, I am told, reckon no Ordination valid except that of our Biſhops; thoſe amongſt them who have not been ordained and yet ſometimes harangue, are ſaid only to give a "word

[p] Veneer, page 523, &c.

[q] Dr. Prieſtley, Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2, page 64.

[r] See Dr. Zach. Grey's Preface to Hudibras. Originally the Independents do not ſeem to have ordained; after their uniting with the Preſbyterians, they ſometimes did, and then they uſed Impoſition of Hands.

[s] Heylin's Preface, Sect. 23.

[t] Neal 2, page 252.

[u] The *Quakers* are mentioned Moſheim, Cent. 17. Sect. 2. Part 1. Chap. 4, end, (or 8vo. Vol. 5, page 44.) and their ſilent meetings accounted for.—See alſo Book III. Chap. XIV. Sect. XII. of this work.

"word[x] of Exhortation:" yet they ſeem to be diſtinguiſhed in ſome way; and appearances are as if they were maintained.

VII. The reaſon why *uninterrupted ſucceſſion* is ſo much valued, is, becauſe the incapacity of any one perſon who ordains, might be ſuppoſed, in ſtrictneſs, to invalidate, or vitiate, all ſubſequent Ordinations.—On this principle ſome *American* Biſhops have been conſecrated in England, and their Conſecration regulated by an Act of Parliament.

VIII. Dr. *Prieſtley*, in his addreſs to the Methodiſts, lately[y] publiſhed, prefixed to Mr. Weſley's Letters, adviſes the Methodiſts to form ſeparate Societies with whatever rules they think proper: and adds, "Let any perſon whom you think qualified, teach and exhort others, whether he be in *holy orders*, as it is called, or not; and if they[z] be qualified to teach, they are certainly qualified to adminiſter all the ordinances of the Goſpel, Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper. I know of no excluſive right that any men, or body of men, have to this privilege[a]."

IX. It ſeems worth while, before we cloſe our Hiſtory, to obſerve, that in events which have relation to the doctrine of our preſent Article, there have happened many caſes of *Neceſſity*.—When people have been ſick, or out of the reach of a place of Chriſtian worſhip, or under perſecution, or without tolerably good laws; in ſuch caſes, things

[x] Acts xiii. 15.—Heb. xiii. 22.

[y] This was written in 1791.

[z] The word "*they*" ſeems to mean the ſame as "*any perſon*;" ſometimes perhaps *they* is uſed concerning a *ſingle* perſon when the *ſex* is not ſpecified. Whether Dr. Prieſtley meant, by *plural* following ſingular, to include, or not exclude, *female* Miniſters, I will not take upon me to ſay. The word "*he*" occurs juſt before "*they*."

[a] Page xxix.

things could not take their regular courſe; practice could not correſpond to Theory. All that could be aimed at, muſt have been, to come as *near* the Theory as poſſible.—This kind of irregularity has happened ſometimes with reſpect to *Preaching*, ſometimes with reſpect to *Baptiſm*, and the *Lord's Supper*: it has alſo affected *Ordination*; and *Marriages*.

Of a caſe of neceſſity in *preaching* we have a remarkable inſtance in the Converſion of *Iberia* to Chriſtianity[b]. A female captive converted the King and Queen, who preached to their People, and converted them; but then they ſent to Conſtantine for a Biſhop and Clergy as ſoon as they were able.—Or, not to go ſo far for an inſtance, I have known Chapels in the Dioceſe of Cheſter, ſerved by perſons not ordained; ſometimes, I think, ſerving them before Ordination, was a condition of poſſeſſing them afterwards.

Origen, while a Layman, taught Divinity in the Catechetical Chair of Alexandria[c], even in the preſence of his Biſhop; the thing was blamed, but not the preacher.

X. The caſes of neceſſity in regard to Baptiſm, may beſt come under the twenty-ſeventh Article: ſuch as Baptiſm by women, clinic Baptiſm, &c.

And thoſe relating to the Lord's Supper, under the twenty-eighth; as ſacrament without the uſual elements; family-ſacraments, &c.

XI. We have already[d] mentioned, that at the Reformation, foreign Divines, not being able to get

[b] Socrates, Hiſt. Eccleſ. Theodoret, 1. 24, &c.—Forbes, 16. 6. 21.—Burnet on the Article, page 322, 8vo.

[c] Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. 6. 13.—Forbes, 16. 6. 22.—Heylin's Tracts, page 294.

[d] Sect. IV.

get ordained by Biſhops, applied to Preſbyteries. —It happened that ſome Engliſh Divines were abroad at the time, and were obliged to have recourſe to the ſame expedient. Their ordinations were allowed as valid[e], in King Edward's time; but in the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's reign legal diſputes aroſe whether they could claim *tithes*, &c.; and in the reign of James the Firſt the validity of ſuch ordinations was denied[f].—In 1644, when the Biſhops declined ordaining any but thoſe who were well inclined to King Charles the Firſt, the Aſſembly of Divines[g], took ſeveral ſteps to have ordination performed without their aſſiſtance; but it was only *pro tempore*[h]; there were then no Preſbyteries in England.

XII. Bingham ſays[i], that *Marriages* were ſolemnized by the Chriſtian Clergy for 300 years; but that the mixture of Heathens and Chriſtians made many extraordinary caſes. The ſacerdotal Benediction got evaded, when the laws became Chriſtian; becauſe they contained no injunctions to ſupport it; poſſibly Chriſtians, before that time, wiſhed rather, of themſelves, to have Chriſtian than Heathen marriage.—But in the eighth and ninth Centuries, the original Chriſtian marriages, by the Prieſt, were revived.—Sir William Blackſtone[k] obſerves, that the intervention of the Prieſt in the marriage-contract "is merely *juris poſitivi*, and not *juris naturalis aut divini*." "In the times of the grand rebellion, all marriages were performed by the *Juſtices of the Peace*; and theſe marriages

[e] Neal 1. 55. [f] Neal 1. 503, top.

[g] See an account of this, Grey's Pref. to Hudibras, page xxviii.

[h] Neal, Vol. 2, Index, Ordination.

[i] Antiquities 22. 4. 2, 3.

[k] Vol. 1. ſee Index, *Marriage*. Marriage in *Scotland* is ſaid to be a *civil* contract.

marriages were declared *valid*," by Act of Parliament after the Reſtoration.

Our Church is againſt[l] re-baptizing and re-ordaining. At *Lauſanne* a perſon who appears to be a Layman, reads the ten commandments, in the pulpit; as appears from the letter of a friend of mine written at Lauſanne. Laymen have uſually read *Leſſons* in Cathedrals, and other places of worſhip.

XIII. Let us now proceed to our *Explanation*[m].

The *title* of this twenty-third Article, differs ſomething from that of the correſponding one in 1552: ours is, "Of miniſtering in the Congregation;" that of 1552 is, "No man may miniſter in the Congregation except he be *called*."—The word "*called*" does occur in the body of our Article, but it ſeems beſt not to have a *propoſition* in a *Title*, when it can be eaſily avoided.

What is to be underſtood by "miniſtering," we were obliged to mention before we entered upon our Hiſtory.

"*In the Congregation*,"—of the word *Congregation* we ſpoke under the nineteenth Article[n]: here it may

[l] Puller's Moderation of the Church of England, page 307.—At Iſlington, I am told, a Popiſh prieſt, turned Proteſtant, does duty, without any re-ordination. Conſult Biogr. Britan.—Life of *Bramhall*, Note (R), for an inſtance of re-ordination.—In my Pariſh a woman, who had been baptized as a Diſſenter, wanted me to re-baptize her in the Church, as an adult: I declined.

[m] I ſhould have thought it would have been better if the 22d Art. had come after this, rather than before it: the order of the ſubjects would then have been, 19. A Church.—20. Its Authority.—21. A number of Churches acting together.—22. Who has a right to miniſter in a Church.—23. Of Popiſh Doctrines.—24. Continuation of Popiſh doctrines; of having public devotions in a language not known to the unlearned. There was probably ſome good reaſon for the preſent order, though it does not occur to me.

[n] Art. XIX. Sect. V.

may perhaps only have its moſt uſual ſenſe, of an *Aſſembly*; or it may be thus interpreted; an *whole Church*; that is, as large a ſociety of Chriſtians as, in any ſituation, act together by a common underſtanding: or a ſeparate *aſſembly*, conſidered as *part* of an whole church. But if *Congregation* be taken in the ſame ſenſe with Εκκλησια, that ſenſe was alſo mentioned.—Εκκλησια does indeed, in ſcripture, though it ſeveral times ſtands for the *whole* church of Chriſt, ſometimes mean merely an Aſſembly; ſometimes a ſmall one, ſuch as would be contained in the *houſe* of a new[o] Convert.—Perhaps this uſe of the word Εκκλησια, might give riſe to the congregational Churches of the *Independents*.

At the Hampton-Court conference before King James the Firſt, in 1603, the Puritans deſired that theſe words "*in the Congregation*," might be omitted in this Article, "as implying a liberty for men to preach *out* of the Congregation without a lawful call[p]."

XIV. "*Public*" ("preaching," &c.)—this muſt be oppoſed to *private* (preaching, &c.)—ſuch as reading a ſermon to a family: or preſiding in family devotions.—Mal. iii. 16.—I apprehend, that teaching would be private in any aſſembly not under eccleſiaſtical authority; though there might be good reaſons for not encouraging religious harangues to numerous companies who were not under ſuch authority. What is uſually called *private Baptiſm*, as oppoſed to that which is performed in Churches publicly, is, properly, adminiſtered in a *congregation*[q]; as is alſo the communion

[o] 1 Cor. xiv. 24.—Rom. xvi. 5.—Col. iv. 15.—Veneer mentions the Athenian Εκκλησιαι, page 526.

[p] Neal's Hiſt. Puritans, Vol. 1, 4to. page 415.

[q] "Regard, we beſeech thee, the ſupplications of thy Congregation."—The prayer containing theſe words muſt, I ſhould

munion of the ſick; according to Matt. xviii. 20. and Tertullian's maxim, "Ubi tres, Eccleſia[r] eſt."

XV. "*Called*"—"*ſent*"—"*choſen and called.*"

"*Called*,"—this is a word frequently uſed in Scripture: it ſeems to be the old Engliſh for *invited:* and it is uſed chiefly of mens being invited into the Chriſtian religion. Such invitation, or calling, is often ſaid to come from God: but the meaning only is, that ſo important an event as a man's being made a Chriſtian, ought to be *referred* to Divine Providence, though we cannot refer it with diſtinct ideas of the divine agency.—Of this referring events to God, we ſpake largely under the tenth and ſeventeenth Articles.—One *called*, is ſometimes only a name for a Chriſtian; as 1 Cor. vii. 17—21. and in the Parable (or Parables) of the marriage-ſupper, the invitation denotes mens becoming Chriſtians, when referred to the divine Government of the world. God may call by man, or by human authority. Here, called means, more particularly, invited into the *Miniſtry*; and in this ſenſe it is uſed by St. Paul at the beginning of his Epiſtle to the Romans, and of his firſt to the Corinthians.

"*Sent*"—is generally appropriated to *Miniſters*. Our Saviour is not ſent but unto the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael: (our Saviour's being ſent, occurs a great number of times)—the *Apoſtles* take the name of their office from being *ſent*: and other miniſters are diſtinguiſhed by their being ſaid to have a *miſſion*.—See Matt. x. 16.—xxiii. 37.—Luke

ſhould think, be one of the Collects uſed at private Baptiſm; as ſanctifying the water.

[r] Quoted by Veneer, page 527, "from Tertullian's Exhortation to Chaſtity," page 457.

Luke iv. 26.—xxii. 35.—John xx. 21.—Acts xiii. 4.—Rom. x. 15.—1 Cor. i. 17.—Some notice alſo ſhould be taken of the paſſages which compare miniſters to *labourers*, Matt. ix. 38. and xxi. 34. Theſe paſſages were all in the minds of our reformers when they uſed the word "*ſent*."

Choſen and[s] called"—when ſpoken of together, in ſcripture, uſually ſeem to mean different *ſteps* in admiſſion to Chriſtianity: Calling is the firſt propoſal, and chuſing the final appointment: ſome begin the negotiation, but do not complete it: or, more begin it than complete it; or, in the ſcripture ſtile of compariſon; "*many* are called, but *few* are choſen."

The word *choſen*, as well as *called*, is ſometimes uſed with relation to the Miniſtry:—ſee Acts i. 24.—ix. 15.—xxii. 14.—2 Tim. ii. 4—but there is a variety of expreſſions for the ſame thing; *ordained*, *appointed*, *ſeparated*, &c. it might be uſeful to ſee the marginal references, Acts ix. 15.—When *choſen* relates to the *Miniſtry*, it ſeems to be ſomething *prior* to *called*; but more commonly *poſterior*: one old edition of the Articles has *ſent*, *called*, *choſen*: (ſee Bennet's Collation, page 87).

From this interpretation of the expreſſions of Scripture it appears, that being called to the Miniſtry, does not imply anything of ſuch immediate communication with heaven that we muſt be ſenſible of it at the time: does not imply any ſuch thing as the Inſpiration of the myſtics; who ſeem to miſtake the meaning of ſuch expreſſions.

XVI. I can ſee one difficulty; it may perhaps be aſked how thoſe who propoſe *themſelves* for orders, can be ſaid to be *called*? When a man propoſes himſelf, he only declares, that if he is appointed,

[s] Called, Art. XVII. Sect. XLIV.—Choſen, Art. XVII. Sect. XL.

appointed, he will *accept* the appointment: and the nature of human affairs make this mode neceſſary. Though it might be the moſt perfect method, if perſons in authority did keep ſo exact an account of the characters of all men, that they could actually *invite* to the Miniſtry all thoſe who were likely to do the moſt good in it; yet if we ſpeak with relation to the preſent imperfect ſtate of things, we muſt ſay, that no eccleſiaſtical magiſtrate can know of all who would accept the office of miniſter; and this method is as inconſiſtent with ſelf-ordering, as any[t] other.

Calling means inviting; now inviting ones ſelf to the houſe of a friend, does not deſtroy the eſſence of his invitation; though the form may be a little changed. But, what is moſt to the purpoſe, thoſe of whom it is ſaid in ſcripture that they were called, did generally, no doubt, propoſe *themſelves* for Baptiſm. At leaſt, any one who had propoſed himſelf, and had been baptized, would have been ſpoken of, on looking back upon the

[t] The Puritans, in Synods, determined, that no one ſhould offer himſelf for Orders; every one ſhould be really *called* by ſome Congregation.

Neal 1, page 231.——See alſo Latimer's Sermon on St. Andrew; Vol. 1, page 160, 8vo. where there are ſome good things on *Patrons* calling proper Miniſters; but his advice to men not to become Miniſters except they be called, might perplex a modeſt man, or encourage an enthuſiaſt. Yet he does not ſeem to mean more than that no one ſhould take orders from views of mere worldly advantage; or from pride, vanity, &c. for he ſpeaks of that as a man's *vocation* to which he has been regularly "*brought up.*" If therefore a young man were to fix upon the Miniſtry as his Profeſſion, and go through a courſe of Education ſuited to make him fit for it; or was to be invited into the Church by a pious *patron*, he would, I ſhould imagine, come under Biſhop Latimer's notion of one *called*. —*Korah*, &c. Numb. xvi. were uncalled; or impious intruders.

the whole of the tranſaction, as *called*; that is, called by the Providence of God, uſing what means ſeemed beſt to his infinite wiſdom.

Baxter, at the end of his Hiſtory of Councils, enumerates ſome particular acts of the Government of God in calling Miniſters.

XVII. "*By men*"—that is by men *immediately*; the call may be *referred* to God, as has been ſeen. A miniſter is lawfully appointed, though without *ſupernatural* powers; without being *inſpired*, ſo that he can be immediately ſenſible of the inſpiration; without having a power of working *Miracles*;—and yet ſo *called*, he may be called of *God*[u].

I ſuppoſe the miniſters of our Church have had it objected to them, that they are not true miniſters, becauſe they have not the Spirit: and becauſe they work no miracles.

XVIII. "*Who have public authority given unto them in the congregation*"—this ſeems to leave the *manner* of giving the power of ordaining, quite free: it ſeems as if any religious ſociety might, conſiſtently with this Article, appoint officers, with power of ordination, by election, repreſentation, or lot; as if, therefore, the right to ordain did not depend upon any uninterrupted *ſucceſſion*[x].

XIX. "*The Lord's Vineyard*"—this expreſſion does not ſeem to be uſed merely for ornament; but becauſe the Church of God is ſo frequently called the Lord's vineyard in ſcripture; indeed the ſimilitude is ſo much dwelt upon, that there ſeems ground for *reaſoning* from it, and even deriving *rules*

[u] Not ſeeing this has occaſioned a wrong notion of the whole affair of Church-authority, amongſt the Preſbyterians: ſee that notion deſcribed by Dr. Balguy, Ser. 7, page 114 and 116, referring to page 13, bottom.—See alſo before, Art. XX. end of Sect. 11.—And Baxter on Councils, page 471, 472. Objection 10. & 12.

[x] See Forbes, 16. 6.—Biſhop Horne as before, Sect. IV.

rules for practice. The *Jews* were once the Church of God; and Chriſtians are[y] ſo now.—Conſult Pſalm lxxx. 8—16.—Cant. viii. 12.—Iſ. v. 1—7. —Matt. xx. 1—16.—Matt. xxi. 33—41.—The Pſalm may relate properly to the Jewiſh Church; the Prophecy to the Jewiſh Church primarily, or perhaps to the Church of God in general: Matt. xx. to both Jewiſh and Chriſtian. —Matt. xxi. to Chriſtian only.

xx. This Article is not to be ſuppoſed to make any rules or laws, or any proviſion for caſes of *neceſſity*. They make proviſion for themſelves; Neceſſity has no Law.

xxi. We now come to our *Proof*.

I do not ſee that there need be more than one propoſition.

xxii. 'It is not right to miniſter in any religious ſociety, without an appointment from that ſociety[z].'

This muſt be proved from Scripture, though really ſcripture only ſpeaks, as it were, incidentally; taking for granted that religious ſociety cannot be carried on in any rational or effectual way, without an appointment of miniſters.

With regard to the old Teſtament, there can be no doubt but Prieſts and Levites, and prophets were diſtinguiſhed from other men: and ſevere puniſhment inflicted when this diſtinction was invaded: ſee Numb. xvi. Puniſhments were of courſe

[y] Taylor on Romans, Key, No. 52. 133.

[z] There might be another propoſition, affirming, that ordination may be valid, without the intervention (as far as we can diſcern) of any thing *ſupernatural*. But as ideas of ſupernatural powers being given to Miniſters, have ariſen from a wrong interpretation of thoſe texts, which ſpeak of the Agency of God, and of referring events to his Agency, and as the meaning of thoſe paſſages has been explained, a ſecond propoſition ſeems needleſs.

courſe ſupernatural where the Government was ſo. I will therefore only bring paſſages from the new teſtament, and that in the order in which they now ſtand.

The tenth chapter of St. Matthew ſhould be read entire, and ſtudied by every one, who either propoſes to be a miniſter, or is called upon to appoint others.

See next, Matt. xxiv. 45.—xxviii. 18, &c.

John iii. 27.—x. 16.—xxi. 15, &c.

Acts i. 22.—viii. 17.—x. 3—5.—But Acts xiii. 2. the ſolemn[a] ſeparation of St. Paul, muſt ſtrike as ſomething extraordinary, after his miraculous converſion before related, namely, in Chap. ix. Any one properly attentive, fixing his thoughts on this, would naturally exclaim, 'it was not enough, then, to authorize Paul to go and preach the word, that he had been ſtruck blind by the immediate and ſupernatural power of God! that the general deſign of divine Providence, in teaching men a new religion, had been expreſsly communicated to him by a voice from Heaven! that Ananias had been ſent to him, as to a choſen veſſel unto God, to bear his "name before the Gentiles, and Kings, and the children of Iſrael," to deliver him from a blindneſs of three days!—this choſen veſſel muſt ſtill be conſecrated "*by men*;" men muſt faſt and pray over him, and lay their hands upon him, before he could be a legitimate preacher of the holy Goſpel!—nay, that very perſon muſt be thus commiſſioned by the inſtrumentality of men, who could ſay of himſelf with more propriety than any other miniſter of the Goſpel, that he was "an Apoſtle not of men, neither by man." (Gal. i. 1.)'

We

[a] How inconſiſtent is all this with Socinus's notion and Dr. Prieſtley's that any man may miniſter! This inconſiſtency ſhould be marked now and then, in going through theſe texts.

We ſhould alſo conſult Acts xiv. 23. and xx. 28, 29. where thoſe meaſures muſt be ſuppoſed to be enjoined, which are neceſſary to defend the flock from *wolves:* an end not to be anſwered without authority.

Rom. x. 13, &c. has been mentioned in the explanation: as have ſeveral texts which are to our preſent purpoſe.

1 Cor. iv. 1, 2. *Stewards* are not ſelf-appointed.

Chap. xii. 16. 19. 27. 29, 30.—Chap. xiv. in general, but the laſt verſe ſeems of itſelf ſufficient.

2 Cor. v. 20.—Eph. vi. 20. ("in *bonds*")—*Ambaſſadors* are not ſelf-appointed.

Eph. iv. 11.—1 Tim. iii. 1.—2 Tim. ii. 2.—Titus i. 5.—Heb. v. 4, 5, &c. and 12.—Heb. xiii. 17. compare with ver. 7.

One might alſo venture to bring as Proof, ſome conſiderations from the nature of cultivating a *vineyard.* All cannot preſide, and direct; all cannot do the nicer parts of the work; ſome muſt dig, and do the more ordinary offices, and follow the inſtructions of others.—This muſt be the caſe even if the Lord was preſent; but when he is away, he muſt neceſſarily have officers to repreſent him, and enforce his authority[b].

With regard to *reaſoning* on this ſubject, Dr. Balguy's two Conſecration Sermons are ſo perfect, without any ſuperfluity, that I need only recommend them to your peruſal. If you chuſe a ſpecimen, I will take one from the[c] latter ſermon.—Certainly, if miniſters be ſelf-ordained, modeſt merit will never be called forth; preſumptuous vanity will be ever ready to obtrude itſelf; noiſy ignorance will overpower diffident wiſdom: and what

[b] Matt. xxiv. 45.

[c] Dr. Balguy, Ser. 7, page 122. "On the other hand," &c.

what will hinder vicious men from riſing into power; eſpecially if any conſiderable emoluments are annexed to the Miniſtry?—Nay, what can hinder doctrines oppoſite to each other from being taught; to the utter extirpation of all religious principle? What can hinder different men from officiating in ſuch different ways, as to produce diſturbance and confuſion, and put to flight all religious affection? And how can it be brought about, that certain appearances, modes of dreſs and behaviour, ſhall be ſo aſſociated with piety and virtue, as inſtantly to produce good feelings[d] in the mind?—Beſides, the learning requiſite to make a man a good miniſter of Religion, requires, that the Miniſtry ſhould be made a ſeparate *Profeſſion*. How much the opinions of that profeſſion ſhould weigh with the *People* has been ſhewn in the *ſecond Book*.

XXIII. I will here reſt my direct proof: ſome little *indirect* ſeems proper under this Article.

XXIV. *Socinus*[e] produces *Acts* viii. 4. and xi. 19. as proofs, that men could preach in the time of the Apoſtles without being ordained; nay, preach with ſucceſs. But thoſe who, in thoſe paſſages, are mentioned as being diſperſed by perſecution, and as going into foreign countries, might be only on the footing of the captive[f] in *Iberia*, or of the Iſraelitiſh maid, that attended[g] on the wife of *Naaman*:—they being themſelves members of revealed religion, could not but recount, in *converſation*, (λαλουντες[h], Acts xi. 19.) the wonders belonging

[d] No ſtage-players uſed to be allowed to become miniſters: Bingham, 4. 4. 7.

[e] Opera, Vol. 1, page 383.—See Sect. v. of this Art.

[f] Sect. v. [g] 2 Kings v. 2.

[h] The word Acts viii. 4. and Acts xi. 20. is ευαγγελιζω, to tell the good news of; ευαγγελιζειν ελευθεριαν, νικην, &c. to tell the

longing to it; and might very well be ſuppoſed to make converts.—Not but ſome of the diſperſed might have received a regular *commiſſion* to preach; the paſſages contain nothing to the contrary: at all times there have been many converts made by private conference; ſometimes by miniſters, ſometimes by private perſons: this caſe of ſpreading the tidings of Chriſtianity during diſperſion, occaſioned by perſecution, does not ſeem to come up to that of *public* preaching in a *regular* Chriſtian congregation.

XXV. A ſecond objection may be this;

Many of the texts quoted in the Proof juſt now given, relate to the appointments of the *firſt teachers* of the Goſpel, who had *miraculous powers* committed to them. Such teachers muſt be limited, as to their number, and commiſſion.

I ſhould anſwer, that no texts of ſcripture are proofs, but after ſome kind of parity of reaſoning; as was mentioned ſeveral times under the twenty-ſecond Article, and proved in the eleventh Chapter of the firſt Book: difference of circumſtances muſt be attended to. Let then the texts be read over with this view; let a reaſonable man ſee how many things there are in them not peculiar to teachers endued with miraculous powers. How many things, which would have been ſaid had it pleaſed God to truſt the reception of Chriſtianity to reaſoning only; or to prophecies, and ſuch proofs as we now poſſeſs.

Baxter (on Councils, page 465) ſpeaks of *two ſorts* of Miniſters—1. to teach men *new* doctrine, and 2. *ſtanding*

the good news of Liberty, Victory, &c. (ſee Parkhurſt's Lexicon).—Hence an *Evangeliſt* (2 Tim. iv. 5.) may be any perſon, Biſhop, Deacon, or Layman, employed to act as a *Miſſionary*, where Chriſtianity was yet *unknown*; ευαγγελιζειν λογον, or χριστον, to tell *the* good news, of the *Word*, or of Chriſt; any one might do that.

2. *ſtanding* doctrine: but there are as many texts as ſeem natural, circumſtances conſidered, implying a ſucceſſion of miniſters having no miraculous powers. 1 Tim. v. 22.—Tit. i. 5.—1 Pet. v. 2. —Heb. xiii. as before: nor can we conceive Matt. xxviii. 18. or John xxi. 15, &c. to be temporary; or Acts xx. 28.—Paul's ſeparation Acts xiii. 2. ſeems a precedent for after times; his miraculous powers, and immediate revelation might have ſufficed for him.—John x. 16. looks to after times. —Rom. x. 13, &c. is not reſtrained in its ſenſe by times.—Nor is 1 Cor. xiv. 40.—The *Fathers* reaſoned on ſcripture thus.—See Heylin, page 242. Sect. 13.

XXVI. I will next take ſome notice of what has been quoted from *Dr. Prieſtley*. To me it ſeems confuſed, and inconſiſtent with itſelf.—*Confuſed*, as not ſhewing in what character the Methodiſts are addreſſed. Are they addreſſed as Diſſenters, or as members of the eſtabliſhed Church? if as Diſſenters, and they will acknowledge themſelves to be ſuch, I ſee no great difficulty; let them follow his advice; let them appoint perſons to preach and give the Sacraments, in the way they think beſt; and may ſucceſs attend them! may virtue and piety be the reſult! they do nothing inconſiſtent with our Article: ſuch perſons are not ſelf-ordered. Who knows too but in appointing they may uſe *prayer*, and impoſition of hands?—But if they inſiſt that they are members of the Eſtabliſhed Church of England, then they perhaps may be addreſſed as ſuch by Dr. Prieſtley:—and can members of any ſociety be rightly perſuaded to violate the *Laws* of that ſociety? for "the legal deſignation of particular perſons to theſe offices" (the ſacred offices of religion) "cannot but mean,

mean, if it means anything, that all who are not appointed, are[1] excluded."

Perhaps the main purport of Dr. Prieſtley's advice may be to induce the Methodiſts to carry the matter of *exhortation* farther than they do; or ſhall thoſe who exhort, adminiſter *ſacraments?* this might occaſion a greater diſtinction or diſtance between the Methodiſts and the Church of England than at preſent ſubſiſts; but that end we muſt not ſuppoſe to be the end particularly deſired: and I ſee no good purpoſe which it could anſwer to religion in general. The Methodiſts in England do not ſeem to be any way reſtrained in their exhorting; and they are not, that I ever heard, in want of a greater number of Miniſters than they already poſſeſs, for the adminiſtration of the Sacraments.

The paſſage before us appears to me not only to be exceptionable on account of its confounding ſituations, but on account of the *inconſiſtency* of its different parts; as I underſtand them. Dr. Prieſtley firſt ſays, "let any perſon whom you think qualified, teach, exhort, and adminiſter Sacraments:" and afterwards declares (as I underſtand, for the expreſſion is not totally free from ambiguity) that no ſet of men have an "excluſive right" to teach, exhort and adminiſter ſacrament; but if certain men were appointed by the methodiſts, in preference to others, to perform theſe offices, would not they have an excluſive right to perform them?—ſurely it cannot be ſaid, that Dr. Prieſtley does not adviſe the Methodiſts to appoint: the word appoint is not uſed, but ſome perſons are ſpoken of as "*qualified*," in ſuch a manner as to imply that others are *diſqualified*; and who are qualified or diſqualified, the Methodiſts

[1] Dr. Balguy, page 122.

Methodiſts are to determine; is not this, in ſubſtance, appointing? Nor will it, I hope, be urged, that miniſters ſo appointed have no excluſive right to preach, &c. becauſe they cannot exclude other miniſters; they exclude all thoſe from whom they are diſtinguiſhed and ſeparated; which is all that can be meant. No Papiſt would ſay, that ordination, even in his Church, gives ſuch an excluſive right of miniſtering, that no one can lawfully miniſter in a Turkiſh moſque.—But enough.

XXVII. I here put an end to our Proof, direct and indirect; and proceed to the *Application*.

It may not perhaps be amiſs here to take a ſhort form of aſſent.

'It is contrary to ſcripture, and to reaſon, that any man ſhould act as a Miniſter in an eccleſiaſtical ſociety, merely from his own choice: he ought to be appointed. And though it may become him *devoutly* to *refer* his appointment to the Providence of *God*, he is to *act* upon it as an ordinance of *Man*; and to conſider himſelf as receiving it *immediately* from thoſe, who are veſted with *authority* for conferring it, by the religious *Society* to which he belongs.'

XXVIII. There ſeems alſo room for a few words on the ſubject of mutual *conceſſions*.

Though what has been laid down about the appointment of Miniſters, is very *true*, yet it has not an *invariable* force in all caſes. Let us take two *extremes*. In a large *monarchy*, with various ranks of men, if there be a church eſtabliſhed, ſelf-ordering, in ſuch a church, would be greatly inconvenient and hurtful; for the Church would be a large body as well as the State; and every large body requires a great number of ſubordinations to reduce it to unity in action; and when there are many ranks of citizens, nice rules are wanted

wanted in order that each rank may feel the influence of Religion, by means of the Miniſtry. Ambition and intereſt too, in the caſe ſuppoſed, offer ſtrong temptations to worldly men to puſh themſelves into the ſacred orders.

But take the other extreme, and much fewer rules and appointments are wanted. As in ſmall ſelect companies, and ſocieties, you ſometimes ſee every one know his place, the moſt accompliſhed take the lead, and things rightly conducted, by a mere feeling of propriety; ſo can one almoſt conceive it poſſible for a ſmall religious ſociety to proceed, if compoſed of men unaffectedly pious, and aiming at the general good. Perhaps a ſtate of perſecution is moſt likely to occaſion ſuch a ſociety, eſpecially if the people perſecuted, are, like the *Waldenſes*, of great ſimplicity of manners. Yet this, I fear, is rather too Utopian: Religious affections want much regulation; and that is not always ſuſpected; ſo that men are run away with, before they are aware: the pride of teaching religion, ſets ſome men upon teaching it before they are duly qualified; while the habitually modeſt want drawing out, and compelling to ſhew themſelves, by a judgment ſuperior to their own. Ordinarily then, in practice, no religious ſociety ought perhaps to be left without ſome regulations determining who ſhall teach and preſide in it; but yet the nearer any ſociety approaches to this extreme, the fewer rules it need be reſtrained by. In all intermediate caſes, more rules will be neceſſary than in this extreme, and fewer than in the other; and as you approach to the other, before-mentioned, regulations, ſuch as are really wanted, will continually be found more numerous and complicated.

As to thoſe who inſiſt upon it, that all teaching ought

ought to be guided by immediate and ſenſible inſpiration, we can only leave them to their own[k] feelings, if what has been ſaid is ineffectual.

XXIX. If we conclude with any hint reſpecting *Improvement*, we may ſay, that a right agreement, and a ready perception about the nature of *caſes of Neceſſity*, and the duties ariſing from them, might be of conſiderable uſe, in a ſubject where they ſo often occur. When men act irregularly through neceſſity, we excuſe the paſt, but expect regularity in future; the return to regularity is to be with as little delay as poſſible; and reſtitution and compenſation are to be made as far as ability reaches.

It would alſo be very uſeful for men to know habitually, and feel familiarly, as it were, how inſtitutions may be aſcribed to the Providence of God, without their being leſs conſidered as the ordinances of man on that account.

[k] See Dr. Balguy, page 116; referred to before, Art. XV. near end.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXIV.

OF SPEAKING IN THE CONGREGATION IN SUCH A TONGUE AS THE PEOPLE UNDERSTANDETH.

IT is a thing plainly repugnant to the Word of God, and the cuſtom of the Primitive Church, to have publick Prayer in the Church, or to miniſter the Sacraments in a tongue not underſtanded of the people.

---

1. The principal part of the *Hiſtory* of this Article, comes into a ſmall compaſs. The Church of Chriſt got divided, as to the part which we are moſt concerned with, into *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern*; or into *Greek* and *Latin: Conſtantinople* being the capital of the Eaſtern empire, became the capital of the Greek Church: and ſo *Rome* of the Latin Church. *Liturgies* muſt of courſe be made in Greek for one country, and in Latin for the other. In both parts of the world, ſuch Liturgies would ſpread; they would alſo become venerated and ſacred; on that account they would be continued, and perſiſted in, even when they became unintelligible to the common people. To change them would have been to alter "the univerſal[a] order of God's Church." The ignorance of the people, and their ſuperſtition, made barbarous devotions not

[a] Rhemiſts on 1 Cor. xiv.

not unacceptable to them; the abuſe was carried on till it was checked, in the weſtern church, by the Reformation[b].

This is the chief part of our Hiſtory; but it may be proper to mention a few more facts which have ſome relation to the ſubject of forms of devotion in words not commonly underſtood.

There ſeem to have been myſtical *carmina* in many ages. — Magicum carmen: — Magorum Carmina. — Clemens Alexandrinus, Strom. 1. mentions ſome Heathens, "who thought thoſe prayers moſt effectual, which were uttered in a barbarous language." (Comber's Advice, page 82, 83.)

One *Elxai*, a leader of a Chriſtian ſect in early times, is ſaid to have ordered his followers to uſe an unintelligible prayer. We have the words in Epiphanius's nineteenth Hereſy: as Epiphanius did not underſtand them, we may conceive it poſſible, that they were not underſtood by thoſe who uſed[c] them.

The *Jews* ſpoke Syriac and Greek, in common converſation, when they uſed pure Hebrew in their Synagogues[d]. It has been thought, that the earlieſt Chriſtian Liturgies were in Hebrew. (See Brerewood, chap. 26. page 185.)

The *Copts*, or Chriſtians in Ægypt, have ſervice in the old Ægyptian, or *Coptic*, though even the Prieſts themſelves underſtand very imperfectly what they pronounce. *Arabic* is, as I have been informed,

[b] By what degrees the Latin ceaſed to be a vulgar tongue in Italy, Gaul, &c. how far by incurſions of barbarous nations, how far by other cauſes, is a difficult ſubject. Something upon it may be found in *Brerewood's* Enquiry, Chap. 2. 4. 5.—And in *Uſher*, cap. 4.—And Wharton's addition, cap. 4.

[c] See Lardner's works, Vol. 9. page 514.

[d] See Locke's Note on 1 Cor. xiv. 4. page 129, quarto.

informed, the language commonly[e] uſed in Ægypt ſince the ſixteenth Century.

Many Greek Chriſtians do not pray in the Greek which they commonly talk, but in pure Greek[f]: and this, in all their Monaſteries, though in Africa. The *Romaniſts* allow the propriety[g] of pure Greek when uſed; and they do not object to Hebrew.

The *Ruſſians* are ſaid to uſe the *Sclavonian*, (which is ſpoken of as an extenſive or general language) in their places of worſhip[h]. — And the Mohammedans Arabic; where it is not the vernacular tongue.

Notwithſtanding theſe inſtances, it does not appear, that in the Chriſtian Church there was any notion of prayers in an unknown tongue, as a thing ſettled and defended, for 600 or 800, or perhaps 900 years. Bingham ſays[i] 1000; but muſt not Latin, &c. have ceaſed to be vernacular in leſs than 1000 years?

There is a famous paſſage in Origen's work againſt Celſus[k], in which he replies to an objection made

[e] Book 1. Chap. 1x. Sect. v. But Brerewood thinks, that the Coptic prayers are in Syriac, or in a ſecond ſort of Chaldee.

[f] So, I think, Ricaut ſays.—See Veneer, page 634, and Brerewood, page 196, bottom.

[g] Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. fol. 294.

[h] The Engliſh Chaplain at St. Peterſburgh informed a friend of mine in 1790, that the common people underſtand this Sclavonian, but imperfectly.

Brerewood ſpeaks of Ruſſian, as a dialect of Sclavonian, page 200: he ſays too, that Sclavonian is the vulgar tongue of more than one third of Europe; that ſixty nations ſpeak it.

[i] See Fulke on 1 Cor. xiv. in Rhem. Teſt. Sect. 8. and 15. —Brerewood, Chap. 26, page 185. and Bingham, Book 13. Chap. 4. Sect. 1.

[k] Orig. contra Cel. Lib. 8. 13. The God of all languages hears men pray in all languages, as with one voice.—*Bennet* on this Article has this paſſage: (that is, in his *Directions*, &c.) For Valentinians ſee Appendix to the firſt Book, Sect. XVIII.

made to the Chriſtians, as if they addreſſed *Angels* by barbarous names, and thought their prayers would have no effect if they did not: this might be true of Valentinians, &c. but in clearing Chriſtians in general, he ſays, 'Ο πασης διαλεκτυ κυριος των απο πασης διαλεκτυ ευχομενων ακυει.'

Here I will read a paſſage from our Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments. (page 279, 280, octavo.)

In *Jerom's*[l] works we have an account of the funeral of his Diſciple *Paula*, a Roman Matron: multitudes from the cities of Paleſtine attended it: In order that every one might have a clear underſtanding of ſome part at leaſt of the Service, Pſalms were ſung in four different languages; Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, Latin[m]. Dr. Fulke gives a pretty tranſlation of a paſſage in the Epitaphium Nepotiani, ending with, "the ſavage nature of the *Beſſes*[n]," "have now broken their harſh language into the ſweet ſong of Chriſt."

It appears, that Latin was ſpoken by ordinary people in *Africa*, in the time of *Auguſtin*; he ſays, that he learnt it by hearing his Nurſes[o] talk it; and that he ſometimes uſed expreſſions, as did other perſons, which were rather vulgar, in order to ſuit himſelf to the more ordinary people[p]: theſe expreſſions muſt be in Latin.

Pope

[l] T. 4. Ed. Ben. Epitaphium, ad Euſtochium; Euſtochium was the daughter of Paula: ſee Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. 1 Cor. xiv. Sect. 8. The Roman Paula, of noble birth, had left Rome, and travelled into Paleſtine, &c. where ſhe had founded Monaſteries, &c. there ſhe died.

[m] The word *Hebrew* is not in all the MSS.

[n] Ad Heliodorum, Tom. 4. Edit. Bened.—Heliodorus was the Uncle, I think, of Nepotianus.—*Beſſi*, in Thrace; to the S. of the moſt ſouthern part of the Danube.

[o] Confeſſ. 1. 14. mentioned by Fulke on 1 Cor. xiv. Sect. 14. Rhem. Teſt.

[p] Aug. in Pſal. 123. 128, Et de Doct. Chriſt. 2. 13.—

Fulke

Pope Leo III. however, as alſo a Pope Benedict[q], ordered, that the Nicene Creed ſhould be uſed in Greek, even in the Latin Church; during public worſhip: leſt το σενον της διαλεκτω ſhould give occaſion to ſome *blaſphemy*.—Το σενον, &c. is tranſlated (by Uſher[r], I ſuppoſe,) "idiomatis *anguſtia*;" the Greek account of this matter is from a fragment of *Photius*.—At all times, probably, one great reaſon for not uſing the Vulgar Tongue, has been the fear of *Profanation*.

Cave[s] mentions that Pope John VIII. whom he places in 872, did, in the year 880, when the *Moravians* were converted, allow them "ſacra peragere linguâ vernaculâ;" that is, in the *Sclavonian*.

Innocent III. (the depoſer of King John of England) held a Council of *Lateran*, (that is, in a Church dedicated to St. John at Rome, and called Lateran, from the Palace[t] on whoſe ſcite it ſtands) in 1215. A part of Chap. ninth of the Acts of this Council, is tranſlated by Dr. Fulke[u]; in

Fulke ibidem. Here might be mentioned *Juſtinian*; placed by Cave A. D. 527; (but the *Novellæ* conſtitutiones after 535.) who ordered Prieſts to ſpeak ſo as to be heard and underſtood. Novell, 137, cap. 6. (page 682 of Corpus, 8vo. Tom. 2.) this mentioned by Fox, page 9. Martyrology (or Acts and Monuments,) and in our Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments; and in Bingham.

[q] Benedict the *third*, I ſuppoſe; though there were ſeveral ſhort-lived Popes between Leo and him.

[r] See Uſher, de Symbolis, page 25.

[s] Hiſt. Lit. T. 2. page 61, or Index, Joannes VIII. Papa. But Dr. Fulke gives this to Pope Nicholas I. (him Cave places in 858,) Rhem. Teſt. on 1 Cor. xiv. Sect. 8.—He does not ſay *Moravians*, but *Scalvonians*. Burnet alſo mentions the fact.

[t] Chambers ſays, in his Dictionary, *Lateran* was firſt the name of a *Man*, then of the *Palace* where he lived; then of the *Church*, &c. built from that Palace.

[u] On Rhem. Teſt. on 1 Cor. xiv. Sect. 8.

in which it is ordered, that in thoſe places where men of different nations mix, proper perſons ſhould be provided to celebrate divine ſervice in their different *languages*, and according to their[x] different ceremonies. Yet this ſame Pope oppoſed the people of Metz (Metenſes) about their having the *Scriptures* in their Vulgar Tongue; but not in any Council: In this Council of Lateran, Cave ſays, there were many Orators from foreign Courts.

It ſeems as if the *Schoolmen* might be reckoned amongſt the *adverſaries* to Prayers in an unknown tongue. Archbiſhop Uſher (de Scrip. et Sacris vernaculis, page 235,) has ſomething to the purpoſe. Thomas Aquinas owns, that prayers were in the vulgar tongue in the time of Chriſt. I ſee alſo, he ſays, that though Chriſt *could* have ſpoken different languages, he ſpoke only one; becauſe he ſpoke only to one nation. Dr. Comber tells us, that Gabriel Biel pleads ſtrongly for having prayers in a known tongue. (Advice, &c. page 84.)

The authors of the Rhemiſh Teſtament ſhew no reſerve in defending the uſe of prayers, &c. in Latin; I mean, by thoſe who do not underſtand it: they uſe many arguments in favour of their opinion; ſuch of thoſe arguments as ſeem to have any weight, may be examined by and by.—We have in the margin, "The Peoples[y] devotion nothing the leſſe for praying in Latine."—And, "It is not neceſſarie to underſtand our prayers[z]."

The Council of Trent is more guarded; it orders frequent *explanations*[a] to be made by the Paſtors, of what is ſaid at Maſs; theſe are to be made on

[x] Brerewood mentions this, page 189.

[y] On 1 Cor. xiv.—Fulke's Sect. 13 and 14.

[z] Here one might read Sir Edwin Sandys's Speculum Europæ, page 7.

[a] Seſſ. 22. Cap. 8.—Alſo Canon 9.

on Sundays and Holidays:—And that, leſt the *ſheep* of Chriſt ſhould be hungry, and the *babes* want bread.—Yet thoſe are anathematized who ſay, that Maſs ought to be celebrated only in the vulgar tongue.

Dupin "allows that divine ſervice may be performed in the vulgar tongue, where that is cuſtomary[b]:" yet he "excuſes the Latin and Greek Churches for preſerving their ancient language;"—and "alledges, that great care has been taken that every thing be underſtood by *tranſlations*."

We may laſtly mention collectively ſome eminent Romaniſts who favoured our opinion:

Cardinal Cajetan, who died 1534, and Nicholas of Lyra, who died 1340, go ſo far as to prefer prayers in the vulgar tongue, as Comber mentions[c]. Gabriel Biel was ſpoken of juſt now as being of the ſame way of thinking. More may be ſeen in Uſher de Scripturis et Sacris vernaculis, cap. 10[d].

Brerewood alſo would furniſh more inſtances of different languages amongſt Chriſtians; but theſe may be ſufficient; ſo here I cloſe my Hiſtory.

11. The *Explanation* need not be long.

The difference between our preſent Article and the

[b] Moſheim, Appendix, as before.

[c] Comber's Advice, page 84.—See alſo Veneer, page 635, who mentions Mercer the famous Hebraiſt. In the preſent age the celebrated Financier Necker wiſhes his Church would give up the uſe of unknown tongues in public Devotions.

[d] By Wharton, 1690, 4to. this ſeems to contain a great deal of learning, but more about the people's reading the Scriptures, than about Sacra being vernacula, in ancient times. Cap. 8. Sect. 4. page 235, is the paſſage lately referred to.—Bingham, 13. 4. gives the title of this Book more fully; Hiſtoria Dogmatica, &c.—He has alſo, I perceive, ſeveral of the ſame inſtances, which have been here made uſe of.

the corresponding one of 1552, is so distinctly marked out by Bishop Burnet, that I refer to him.

The word "Speaking," in the *title*, is explained in the body of the Article, to mean praying and administering Sacraments; *preaching* is not mentioned, because, I suppose, Sermons are every where in the vernacular language: they are so in *France*, and, I doubt not, the case is the same in other[e] catholic countries.

"*Public* prayer"—so that here is nothing of *private* prayer;—this however is spoken of as being sometimes in an unknown tongue, (unknown to him who prays) as well as public: by the Rhemists[f], and in our Homily[g], "Of common-prayer and sacraments."—Private prayer in any tongue understood by him who prays, is allowed in the second Preface to our Prayer-books.

Topics of reason and utility are omitted in our Article, but they are used in our Homily:—and rightly: especially as scripture could not treat the precise question before us.

"A tongue not understanded of the people," includes, in the reason of the thing, a voice that is not *audible*.—I believe it is common in the Roman service for the Priests to perform Masses in such a voice: these may be what are called private Masses:—the French Dictionary of the Academy calls this sort "*basse* messe[h]."

I know

[e] Sir Edw. Sandys, speaking of the Roman religion in general, opposes the Sermons to the Service, when he calls the latter "a *Lampe put out*," &c. page 8. Speculum Europæ.—And it is implied in the directions to Pastors given by the Council of Trent, just now mentioned, that the explanations which they are to give, must be in the vulgar tongue.

[f] 1 Cor. xiv. Sect 13. (Fulke). [g] Page 277, 8vo.

[h] In the 9th Canon, lately mentioned, of the 22d Session of the Council of Trent, those are anathematized, who condemn the rite of the Romish Church, quo summissâ voce pars canonis et verba consecrationis proferuntur.

I know not whether the meaning of the words "*primitive Church*," is quite agreed upon. Bennet, in his directions, gives the above-mentioned paſſage of Origen as a proof, that the primitive church allowed the uſe of different languages: but, literally and properly, the primitive church ſhould mean the *firſt* church; or the Church of Chriſt in the *Apoſtolic age*. Indeed Bennet might reaſon, as[i] Wall does, thus;

Origen was born about 80 years after St. John died[k]: conſider when his grandfather might live; —he might know from his grandfather if the practice of the primitive Church ſtrictly ſo called, favoured ſuch a ſcheme as worſhipping in languages not underſtood:—thus the writings of the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries afford good probable proofs of cuſtoms in the Apoſtolic age.—But yet the Church of England, at the Reformation, was jealous about allowing any authority but ſcriptural; therefore the beſt explanation of "the cuſtom of the primitive church," ſeems to be, the *cuſtoms* mentioned in *ſcripture*.—And conſequently, "the word of God *and* the cuſtom of the primitive church," together, ſhould mean, the directions and practices recorded in the ſcriptures.

But thoſe who wiſh to go farther down, may conſult Bingham's Antiquities, Book 13. Chap. 4. —And Uſher's "Hiſtoria Dogmatica controverſiæ intra Orthodoxos et Pontificios de Scripturis et Sacris Vernaculis."—Eſpecially the fourth and fifth Sections of his eighth Chapter. The title of the fourth Section is, "In Eccleſiâ Primitivâ, commune officium vulgari linguâ celebratum fuit."—But his authorities are only the Apoſtolic Conſtitutions,

[i] On Infant-Baptiſm, Preface.

[k] Origen is placed by Lardner in 230; he was born in 185.

tions, which though ancient, are not now eſteemed genuine: and a Liturgy called St. James's, but probably not to be depended upon as compoſed by an Apoſtle. Theſe ſeem to be his only authorities that pretend to belong to the Apoſtolic age: he quotes from Jerom, Clemens Alexandrinus, Auguſtin and others; and uſes the Liturgies of Baſil and Chryſoſtom; but if theſe give us the cuſtom of the primitive Church, ſtrictly ſo called, we can only believe, that they do ſo on ſuch probable grounds as have been lately explained.

III. We now proceed to *Proof*.

According to what was laſt explained, we need but make one propoſition.—'It is contrary to directions recorded in Scripture, to have Liturgies in any language which is not generally intelligible where they are uſed.'

This matter could not be directly diſcuſſed in Scripture, as has been[1] obſerved of ſeveral others; but the fault mentioned 1 Cor. xiv. of uſing the gift of tongues through oſtentation, when it would perplex inſtead of informing, is open to the ſame arguments and expoſtulations with that of which we are ſpeaking, having Liturgies in unknown languages[m]. We may therefore apply, almoſt immediately, the paſſages of that chapter to our preſent purpoſe. The whole chapter might be read, but we may diſtinguiſh ſome verſes as particularly appoſite; 2. 5. 6. 9. 11. 16. 17. 19. 20. 23. 26. 31. —From theſe and ſeveral other paſſages, it is very clear, that thoſe who had authority in conducting religious

[1] Art. XXII.

[m] See Warburton on the Spirit, page 21.—See alſo Locke on the 4th verſe, where he mentions, that Lightfoot looks upon *the unknown* tongue to mean *Hebrew*. Now if any Jew, turned Chriſtian, uſed Hebrew in Chriſtian Aſſemblies becauſe it was a *ſacred* language, that caſe comes nearer our preſent one than ſpeaking with tongues, in general.

religious aſſemblies, were to adapt their rules and laws to the moral and religious *improvement* of the generality, as alſo to their *comfort*.

The *unlearned* are mentioned repeatedly; and all are enjoined to act like men of *mature underſtanding*.—One can ſcarcely read this chapter to any purpoſe, or even attend to its meaning uninterruptedly, without ſome idea of what was meant by the gift of *Prophecying*. Mr. Locke[a] underſtands it to include three things: predicting ſome events, ſinging inſpired hymns, and interpreting myſtical and difficult parts of ſcripture by inſpiration:—this interpreting is diſtinguiſhable from interpreting what was ſaid in an aſſembly by thoſe who had the gift of *Tongues*.—Prophecying was carried on in the *vulgar* tongue; St. Paul magnifies its worth, in *compariſon* of ſpeaking with tongues; but then he meant in aſſemblies where no foreigners required information.

That the ſcriptures look upon the lower ranks of men as important, appears from many places both of the Old and New Teſtament. The parable of Lazarus might be mentioned in particular. Connect that with John xxi. 15, &c. and with Acts xx. 28, 29. and neglect in edifying the poor and unlearned, will ſeem no trifling matter.—And if St. Paul inſiſts ſo ſtrongly on our attending to principles of Utility, it may be conſidered as a ſcriptural argument to urge, that the better prayers are underſtood, the more good they do; eſpecially if well compoſed, ſo as to comprehend brief and plain expreſſions of the moſt important doctrines; and that it is in vain to compoſe them well, if, at laſt, they are unintelligible.

But we ſhould ſay a word or two of ſcriptural *practice*.—Chriſt ſpoke no unknown tongue: St. Paul

[a] Locke on 1 Cor. xii. 10.

Paul avoided it, and only permitted[o] it, as it were, at home. The office of Interpreter was appointed in order to prevent anything from being finally unintelligible.—The Church of Chriſt ſometimes prayed collectively, as related in Acts iv. 24. and elſewhere. We may add, that no Liturgy was ever originally compoſed in any language not familiar to the people by whom it was to be uſed.

IV. So much for direct proof; ſome arguments of our adverſaries may ſeem perhaps to require an anſwer, or proof of the indirect ſort.—Their arguments in favour of their opinion, are ſo many objections to ours.

1. It has been urged, that the chapter on which we[p] build, does not relate to public worſhip, but only to private *conferences*. But it ſeems to me to relate to *any* meetings *whatſoever*, which could tempt men to diſplay their powers by way of gaining admiration: "*when ye come together*," whereſoever it may be; to ſing, pray, give thanks, prophecy, hear revealed interpretations of Scripture; where the people may be required, or induced, to ſay *Amen*.

The word *church* occurs five times in the chapter, and is oppoſed to "*home*;" the larger the Aſſembly, the greater the abſurdity of puzzling them: the Romiſh argument ſeems to ſuppoſe the contrary.

2. It has been ſaid, that a general language is moſt convenient for *ſtrangers*. The number of learned ſtrangers is very ſmall, in compariſon of that of unlearned natives: beſides, as each ſtranger is at home ſometimes, he receives moſt benefit upon the whole, from the rule of having Liturgies in the vulgar tongue: I ſhould have thought it a great

[o] 1 Cor xiv. 1, (with Locke's note) and 39.
[p] 1 Cor. xiv.

great pity, when I was at Church in Holland, that a Dutch congregation ſhould loſe the edification of a Dutch Liturgy, for any good I ſhould have got from their uſing a Latin one.

3. The Romaniſts are ready to ſay, that their Latin Liturgy is made intelligible by tranſlations, *explanations*, ceremonies[q]: but tranſlations are not uſed in church; I mean, by the Miniſters; the mind does not go with the words by means of a tranſlation only publiſhed, not publicly read.—Thoſe who cannot read, are as much at a loſs in that caſe as without tranſlation. Explanations may give a general idea; but that is very imperfect work: ceremonies make but little impreſſion on thoſe who do not underſtand the words which accompany them. An unconnected word may be explained, ſuch as *Amen*, *Hallelujah*, *Hoſanna*; or ſuch ſhort ſayings as Κυριε ελεησον, Dominus vobiſcum; but a ſentence is quite a different thing; what muſt a ſeries of ſentences be!

4. We are told, that we might ſubmit to unintelligible prayers, becauſe, in any vulgar tongue, many things occur, which are not underſtood, in the Pſalms, for inſtance, and Prophecies. It may be ſo; our knowledge is imperfect, and ſo are our underſtandings; we muſt labour to improve ourſelves; but that is not to be done by purpoſely making things obſcure, where obſcurity can be avoided.

To impoſe ignorance by choice, in matters of revealed religion, is to counteract revelation; which muſt be a good, however men may have it in their power to pervert or miſrepreſent it.—The faculty of ſpeech is a good, though the imperfections in language are great: no one would be willing to loſe the faculty on that account; yet to pray in an

[q] Dupin as above.—Rhem. Teſt. &c.

an unknown tongue is to deprive many human beings of one important uſe of it. But when Pſalms, Prophecies, &c. are the moſt difficult, all people receive *ſome* benefit from them; ſome religious ideas, ſome pious feelings.

5. Sometimes diſpute has been carried ſo far, that it has been ſaid, there is *good* in the common people's not underſtanding Liturgies. If Chriſt had thought ſo, he would have only given us the Lord's prayer in Phœnician, or in Hebrew: and would have forbidden its being uſed in any other language. The people may doubtleſs want inſtruction, and, deprived of it, may attach wrong ideas to religious expreſſions; but every day's teaching may leſſen this evil, and, at the ſame time, mend the *heart*, as well as the underſtanding, of both thoſe who receive inſtruction and thoſe who give it.

6. Laſtly, It has been held, that men are more devout for being ignorant: or, according to the proverbial expreſſion, 'Ignorance is the *Mother of Devotion*.'—That ignorance may occaſion ſome kind of rude, barbarous emotions in the mind, when attending to ſuperior beings, will ſcarcely be denied; but what kind of devotion is that! the ſavage trembles at an Eclipſe, the ignorant attributes the effects of electric fire to the immediate agency of Satan[r]; but this is very different from the devotion ariſing from religious "truth and ſoberneſs[s]." Fanatical terrors have very little effect in giving the mind ſteady and rational principles of action: Ignorance may be the Mother of Superſtition or Enthuſiaſm; it may even conceive and bring forth Hypocriſy; but it will never

[r] Art. x. Sect. 1. where is a paragraph from Doomſday-book of St Julian's Shrewſbury.

[s] Acts xxvi. 25.

never give birth to that *Love* of God and man; which, the better informed it is, has the greater tendency to make the Chriſtian uniformly and effectually virtuous; "ſteadfaſt, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord."

I will mention no more arguments, or objections; you may think I have already mentioned too many, in ſo plain a caſe; but it has ſometimes ſeemed, that objections might lead to profitable obſervations, when they are not formidable to any important truth.

v. What little I ſhall ſay, in the way of *Application*, may be placed either to the head of mutual conciliation, or to that of Improvements: in the preſent caſe what conciliates, improves.

An ancient dead language, it muſt be confeſſed, has, by being fixed, ſome advantages for religious worſhip: it is venerable, free from vulgarity, nay it is ſometimes, as we find from our Latin Articles, even more perſpicuous than an obſolete vernacular tongue. If ſuch language be *general*, it has ſtill more advantages; as Latin is amongſt learned Europeans, French amongſt the polite; and the lingua Franca amongſt the mercantile that have any connexion with any ſhore of the Mediterranean. The Helleniſtic Greek uſed to be very general in our [t] Saviour's time.—If there could be ſuch a thing as a *ſacred* language, that would have ſtrong effects; in the ſame manner as a ſacred edifice; ſet apart entirely for purpoſes of religion. And if ſuch ſacred language could be *fixed* and *general*, it might be worth while to have *Liturgies* compoſed in it, for the uſe of the more improved in all different nations of the Globe. The intercourſe of Nations with each other increaſes daily, and will increaſe as the world improves [u].—I do

[t] Book 1. Chap. vi. page 77. [u] Iſ. xi. 9.—Hab. ii. 14.

do not ſee any impropriety in uſing Latin Prayers in Univerſities; Dr. Heylin ſpeaks of their being uſed at Chriſt Church, Oxford, at early ſervice, when only members of the Univerſity are ſuppoſed to be preſent: and he ſays, he does not underſtand that, at the Reformation, it was "meant but that the morning and evening ſervice might be uſed, in Colleges and Halls of either Univerſity, in the Latine Tongue, where all may be ſuppoſed to underſtand it."—Private prayers are expreſsly allowed to be "in any Language that they themſelves" (the perſons who pray) "do underſtand[x]." —Whatever may be permitted or contrived, of this ſort, ſhould be calculated, not to promote pedantry or oſtentation, but ſpiritual improvement. "Let all things be done[y] unto *edifying*." This muſt be the univerſal principle; and, in any ſtate of which we can have the leaſt conception, it cannot fail to lead us to provide, in every nation, a Liturgy in the vernacular tongue. However, it is one thing to ſay, that a thing ought to be done, and another to ſay, that people have always been unpardonable for not doing it:—there have been times of ſuch groſs darkneſs, that, when we look back upon them, we feel almoſt in a ſtate of indifference about the language in which the people prayed; it occurs to us, at the moment, that they might have been improved; but then again we recollect that the Clergy were little more enlightened than the people: and we apply to the church the words of our Saviour; "if therefore the light that is in thee be darkneſs, how great is that darkneſs!"—Now, however, better proſpects begin to dawn upon us: though

[x] "Concerning the ſervice of the Church."—Prefixed to Prayer-books, in Sparrow's collection, page 201. Q. Eliz. mentions, that the colleges had petitioned for leave to uſe Latin Prayers.

[y] 1 Cor. xiv. 26.

though ſome Popiſh countries may be ſlow and ſluggiſh in advancing towards civilization, yet that which is neareſt to us, has, of late, taken ample ſtrides; and it is firmly to be expected, that, if the rage of *philoſophizing* leaves any ſubſtance of revealed Religion, any Chriſtian Church, of magnitude and importance, there will not, ere long, be any objection to making the forms of public worſhip intelligible to the people[z].

[z] 1797, I leave this as it was written at the end of 1791, to take its chance of ſeeming groundleſs and chimerical.

ARTICLE XXV.

OF THE SACRAMENTS.

SACRAMENTS ordained of Chriſt, be not only badges or tokens of Chriſtian men's profeſſion; but rather, they be certain ſure witneſſes, and effectual ſigns of grace, and God's will towards us, by the which he doth work inviſibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but alſo ſtrengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Chriſt our Lord in the Goſpel; that is to ſay, Baptiſm, and the Supper of the Lord.

Thoſe five, commonly called Sacraments, that is to ſay, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Goſpel, being ſuch as have grown, partly of the corrupt following of the Apoſtles, partly are ſtates of life allowed in the Scriptures: but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any viſible ſign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Chriſt to be gazed upon, or to be carried about; but that we ſhould duly uſe them. And in ſuch only as worthily receive the ſame, they have a wholeſome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchaſe to themſelves damnation, as Saint Paul ſaith.

I. We

I. We have now before us ſeven Articles upon the ſubject of Sacraments; this twenty-fifth treats of Sacraments in general, and of thoſe which we reject. It is always difficult to make general obſervations before thoſe particular ones of which they conſiſt; in the analytical method the particulars would come firſt, but it is moſt uſual to give reaſonings to the world in a ſynthetic form.—The conſequence, however, of treating firſt of Sacraments in general will be, that ſeveral parts of our preſent Article may be paſſed over, without either hiſtory, explanation, or proof; I mean thoſe which, though expreſſed in general terms, relate only to Baptiſm, or the Lord's Supper.

II. Our *Hiſtory*, according to this, need only be of the *ſeven* Romiſh Sacraments, collectively, and of the *five*, taken ſeparately, which we reject.

I ſeem to have a general idea of the manner in which the ſeven Romiſh Sacraments might acquire and loſe their celebrity. Men of religious characters begin with obeying the injunctions of Chriſt, and following the example of his Apoſtles and their immediate ſucceſſors; a ſacred regard for every obſervance grows ſtronger and ſtronger; new particulars ſhew themſelves, in which zeal may be manifeſted and exerted; one pious man tries to go a ſtep beyond another; a third is determined to ſurpaſs them both; ordinances, at firſt ſimple, get to be clogged with a multitude of ceremonies, and adorned with ſplendor[a] and magnificence.—Reaſon makes no oppoſition, or when it makes any is diſregarded, or contemned;—and thus, what was originally rational and plain, runs into exceſs and folly.—Some at length ſee this with the eyes of

[a] Something of this ſort is deſcribed in Moſheim, Cent. 13. Part 2. Chap. 4. Sect. 1. page 107, 8vo. Vol. 3.

of common ſenſe, and labour to impoſe reſtraints and contrive regulations; others encourage themſelves in diſguſt and love of novelty, and, either through paſſion or affectation, throw the whole aſide.

But to be more *particular*.

We are told, that Juſtin Martyr and Tertullian ſpeak of no more[b] ſacraments than two.—The ſame is ſaid of Ambroſe[c], who wrote concerning Sacraments.—Theodoret ſpeaks of ſome Chriſtians who were[d] called *Euchitæ*, becauſe they were for Prayer without Sacraments: and of ſome, who conceived ſo highly of the *ſpiritual* nature of Chriſtianity, that they would allow of no *matter* or element whatſoever. They had the name of *Aſcodrutæ*, Ασκοδρυται, and they are the more worthy of our notice, as their notion ſeems to be the ſame with that of our modern *Quakers*; though the Quakers are ſaid, by Moſheim, to have had their riſe about the middle of the ſeventeenth Century. The etymology of *Aſcodrutæ* is not well underſtood: even Theodoret (Hæret. Fab. lib. 1. cap. 10.) ſeems at a loſs about them; and I have conſulted

[b] Veneer on the Article, page 641.

[c] By Bp. Bramhall; quoted by Puller, page 274.

[d] See Rogers on the Art. he refers to no part of Theodoret's works.—*Euchitæ* (Ευχιται) occur Hæret. Fab. Lib. 4. cap. 11. —They were ſometimes called Meſſaliani, Μεσσαλιανοι, and ſometimes Ενθυσιαστοι: they ſaid, that *Baptiſm* was no more uſeful than a *Razor*; it *cut off* ſin, but did not *extirpate* it; Sin grew again; ſo they were for *Prayer:* I ſee nothing about the *Euchariſt*, in the account of them; they were great *Enthuſiaſts:* They were tried, and, I think, baniſhed, by *Flavian* Biſhop of Antioch; and written againſt chiefly, by *Amphilochius*.—One *Helvetic* Confeſſion, Chap. 19. refers to theſe *Meſſaliani*, under Sacraments in general: and we ſee from that paſſage, that the ideas of our *Quakers* were in being at the time of the Reformation. Syntagma, page 67, of Part 1. The Reformers ſeem to have liked to refer recent errors to old times—See Synt. part 2, page 13. *Donatiſts*.

ſulted a number of books about the name, without obtaining any ſatisfaction. They ſeem to have made this their fundamental principle, that *inviſible* things are not to be completed by *viſible*. Of courſe they *baptized* not; but moreover they had no θεια μυστηρια, no divine *myſteries*. This I underſtood as a general expreſſion, though the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper has ſometimes the name of *the myſteries*. Theodoret next ſpeaks of ſome called *Archontici*, Αρχοντικοι, with whom a knowledge of God, of the myſtic ſort, ſeems to have been all in all: theſe went ſo far as to *anathematize* Το λυτρον, και την των μυστηριων μεταληψιν:—*Baptiſm*, and the receiving of the holy *Myſteries*. —The word απολυτρωσις, which is tranſlated redemptio, means only, a mode of *Baptizing*; and ſo Wall ſeems to have underſtood it.—On Infant Baptiſm, 2. 5. 1.

Auguſtin is ſaid, by the Rhemiſts on Gal. iv. 3. to have ſpoken of the *ſeven* ſacraments which are held by the Romaniſts; and paſſages are quoted from different parts of his works in order to ſhew this; but Fulke ſeems to me to anſwer the Rhemiſts completely.—The opening for diſpute in this matter, is, that we find *Sacramentum* uſed in different ſenſes. It ſeems to be uſed for any *emblematical* action of a ſacred import; or, according to the expreſſion of our Homily[e], for "anything whereby an holy thing is ſignified."—*Waſhing of feet* has been accounted a ſacrament; and in the Greek Church there was a Feſtival called Νιπτηρ[f] (and probably is at this day) in which the Patriarch, or Abbot, or whoever was the head perſon at the place, perſonated our Saviour, and waſhed the

[e] On Common Prayer and Sacraments, page 276, 8vo.
[f] See Cave's Lit. Diſſ. Νιπτηρ.

the feet of twelve poor perſons, who perſonated the twelve Apoſtles: in Monaſteries theſe were poor Monks; and the Steward, or Burſar, took the part of St. Peter, and acted his reluctance; and the Porter was Judas Iſcariot, and underwent much ridicule and many inſults.

In ancient times there was alſo a Sacrament[g] of Catechumens, in which *ſalt* was given them as an emblem of purity and incorruption, with reference, probably, to Matt. v. 13. and Mark ix. 50.—In this extended ſenſe, all the typical acts of the *Jews* were ſacraments; and accordingly, *circumciſion*, eating the *paſchal Lamb*, &c. have been called Sacraments of the *old Law*. In this extended ſenſe of the word ſacrament, it has been diſputed, amongſt Chriſtians, whether there were not *thirteen*[h] Sacraments; and, as *Images*, of Chriſt, Virgin Mary, &c. mean ſomething beyond the viſible figure, it has been aſked whether they might not be conſidered as[i] Sacraments.

I will give you the paſſage of Auguſtin's Letter to Januarius[k], as it is made the beginning of King Edward's Article. It is tranſlated in our Homily, and in Fulke's anſwer to the Rhemiſts on Gal. iv. 3.

Archbiſhop

[g] Bingham, 10. 2. 16. [h] Forbes, 9. 3. 2.

[i] See Forbes, 9. 1. 26. The Trent Catechiſm, Part 2. Sect. x. proves that ſuch a queſtion has been aſked, by anſwering it in the negative.

[k] Ep. 54. or, in a different way of reckoning, Ep. 118.—Primò itaque tenere te volo, quod eſt hujus diſputationis caput, Dominum Noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum, ſicut ipſe in Evangelio loquitur, leni jugo ſuo nos ſubdidiſſe, et ſarcinæ levi: unde ſacramentis numero pauciſſimis, obſervatione facillimis, ſignificatione præſtantiſſimis, ſocietatem *novi* populi colligavit, ſicuti eſt *Baptiſmus* Trinitatis nomine conſecratus, communicatio corporis et ſanguinis ipſius, et ſi quid aliud in ſcripturis canonicis commendatur, &c.

Archbiſhop Bramhall ſays[1] conciſely, "Our church receives not the ſeptenary number of Sacraments, being never ſo much as mentioned in any Scripture, or Council, or Creed, or Father, or ancient author; firſt divided by Peter Lombard in 1439; firſt decreed by Eugenius the Fourth 1528; firſt confirmed in the Provincial Council of Senes 1457; and after in the Council of Trent." Here the number mentioning the time of Peter Lombard, muſt be wrongly printed; Cave places him in 1141;—I ſuppoſe the number belonging to Eugenius is put to Peter[m] Lombard; and ſo on.

Forbes[n] ſays, that Hugo de Sancto Victore, (Hugh of St. Victor) whom he places in 1130, and Cave in 1120, ſeems to him to have firſt mentioned ſeven ſacraments, though Peter Lombard agrees with him.—The Abbot of St. Victor at Paris probably knew Peter Lombard, who lived there, though not as Biſhop of Paris till after Hugo's death. However, it is ſtill more probable that Peter knew the perſon and writings of Hugo.—At the Council of *Florence*, in 1438-9, it ſeems to have been debated between the Greek and Latin Churches whether the ſeven Sacraments were to be obſerved "ſecundùm[o] *uſitatam* in Eccleſiâ Romanâ formam." Whoever firſt fixed on the number

[1] Quoted by Puller, page 275. A Counſellor to the French King, Mr. de la *Militiere*, wrote to Charles II. King of England, before the Reſtoration, inviting him to profeſs Popery, as a likely means to get reſtored: Bramhall anſwers him, in the Addreſs from which this paſſage is taken: Bramhall was then abroad, I think, as well as King Charles; but ſee his Life; the Life of Archbiſhop Bramhall, in the Biographia Britannica.

[m] This conjecture is right; in Bramhall's Letter the three years are put in the margin, all together.

[n] Forbes, 9. 3. 1.

[o] Cave Hiſt. Lit. Tom. 2. page 233.

number ſeven, was probably an happy man; ſo powerful and myſtical a number[p] as it is!—The Trent Catechiſm dwells upon[q] it.

The number *ſeven* was not one of the things firſt changed at the *Reformation*; indeed the five ordinances which the Romaniſts call Sacraments and we do not, are fairly to be *diſtinguiſhed* from all others which have been called ſacraments in the extended ſenſe, in reſpect of their importance, if we take extreme unction for viſitation of the ſick. —*Wickliffe* did not reject them; but then his definition of a ſacrament was only, "a viſible token of ſomething inviſible[r]." In the *Neceſſary Doctrine*, &c. which bears ſo hard upon ſome Romiſh abuſes, ſeven ſacraments are explained, calmly and practically; not in any way of controverſy[s]. In the time of Edward VI. "If ſick perſons deſired to be *anointed*, there was a proviſion[t] for compliance in ſome degree."—*Heylin* tells[u] us, that four of the five ſacraments which we now reject, were "retained under the name of *Sacramentals* in our publick Liturgie;" extreme unction being changed into viſitation of the ſick. But not rejecting the five, might, with our Reformers, amount to little more than not making a ſeparate claſs of our *two*.

The *Romaniſts* are very tenacious of the number ſeven. In the ſeventh Seſſion of the Council of Trent, Canon the firſt, we are anathematized if we make either more or fewer than ſeven: We muſt not make thirteen any more; nor take in the Νιπτηρ of the

[p] See Cruden's Concordance under the word *ſeven*.

[q] Part 2. Sect. xviii. about Sacraments in general, page 137.

[r] Wickliffe's Doctrines may be found in Collier's Eccleſ. Hiſt. but I am not ſure where I ſaw this definition.

[s] Yet many things in theſe explanations, differ from the Romiſh doctrine.

[t] Neal, 1, page 37. in 1548.

[u] Life of Laud, Introd. Sect. xii.

the Greeks, or ſome which the Fathers took in, when they uſed the word Sacrament in its large ſenſe: neither muſt we ſay, that the five are Sacraments in ſome *lower ſenſe* than the other two; they are all ſeven to be allowed *verè* et *propriè* Sacramenta.—We muſt not ſay, that ſacraments are only conſtituted to "confirm[x] our Faith;" this may aim at our Article.—We muſt not deny, that ſacraments *give* grace "*ex opere*[y] *operato*;" tranſlated in the Articles of 1552, "*of the work wrought*."—John Fox blames the Romaniſts for ſaying, that Sacraments "*give* Grace,"—and not only do *ſignifie*, but alſo "*containe* and exhibite that which they ſignifie, to wit, Grace and Salvation[z]."—The Trent Catechiſm ſays, "they have in them an admirable and *ſure* virtue to cure our[a] ſouls."

The Romaniſts ſay, that three ſacraments, Baptiſm, Confirmation and Orders, impreſs a *mark* or *character* (χαρακτηρ) upon the *ſoul*, and alſo give an *outward* diſtinction; that this mark or impreſſion, or ſealing, external and internal, is *indelible*; and therefore, theſe ſacraments cannot be *reiterated*:—(See Trent Catech. Part 2. on Sacraments in general, Sect. 29, &c.)

This ſeems only to mean, that a perſon *once* baptized, confirmed, ordained, is *always* baptized, confirmed, ordained:—which is againſt *re*-baptizing, re-confirming, and re-ordaining: that is, ſuppoſing a man *really* once baptized, &c.—but re-baptizing, &c. have always proceeded on the ſuppoſition,

[x] Canon 5.—John Fox ſays, Sacraments are "*to excite our Faith*:" Vol. 1. page 36. excitare is the word of our Article.

[y] Canon 8.—This will be mentioned under Art. XXIX.

[z] Vol. 1. page 36. Acts and Monuments, or Martyrologie.

[a] Page 145. or laſt Sect 32. of Part 2. on Sacraments in general.—Sect. 10. is mentioned in the ninth Section of this Article.

ſuppoſition, that a man's firſt baptiſm, &c. were improperly called ſuch.—(Like our Divorces a vinculo matrimonii).

If prieſthood be indelible, a Church can never withdraw its Commiſſion from a Prieſt: can never degrade him.

The Rhemiſts ſoften nothing, but[b] maintain the ſeven ſacraments in the fulleſt and ſtricteſt manner. I have already referred to Gal. iv. 3. where, I think, the arguments on both ſides are ſufficiently diſplayed, by them and their anſwerer Dr. Fulke; but other places may eaſily be found.

Even Dr. Dupin[c] "inſiſts, that the *five* Romiſh ſacraments be acknowledged as ſuch, whether inſtituted immediately by *Chriſt*, or not."—In the Acts of the Council of Trent, Canon firſt of Seſſ. 7. we are told, that it is wrong to ſay,—"non fuiſſe *omnia* à Jeſu *Chriſto* Domino noſtro inſtituta."

The author of "Principles and Practices of Methodiſts[d]," mentions as a popiſh doctrine, "that the uſe of ſacraments, accompanied only with an imperfect ſorrow, ſo finiſhes and completes theſe religious acts, that they will be ſufficient to juſtify us."—*Sacramental juſtification* is the term uſed by Divines.—The Trent Catechiſm mentions this[e].

Thoſe whom we call the *Sectaries* have, ſeveral of them run into an oppoſite extreme to that of the Romaniſts. The Reformatio Legum, in the part de Hæreſibus, ſpeaks againſt the ſame perſons with

[b] This queſtion about the efficacy of Sacraments, was much agitated between the Romaniſts and the Reformers. Limborch calls it *Acris quæſtio*, Theol. 5. 66, 21 & 22, page 604.

[c] Moſheim's Appendix, page 131, 8vo. Vol. 6.

[d] Firſt Letter from Academicus, to Mr. Berridge, page 73.—This author is ſuppoſed to have been Biſhop Green, Regius Profeſſor of Divinity at Cambridge.

[e] Page 142. or Sect. 16. Part 2. on Sacraments in general.

with our Article, who would have the Sacraments to be taken "pro *nudis ſignis*, et externis tantùm indiciis," — "quibus, tanquam *notis*, hominum Chriſtianorum religio poſſit a[f] ceteris *internoſci*:" — But in a ſeparate *Title*, *De Sacramentis*, we have firſt a definition of Sacraments, and an account of their efficacy; then the marks of a Sacrament, and a declaration, that thoſe marks are only found in Baptiſm and the Euchariſt. After an account of theſe two, we have ſomething concerning Ordination, Matrimony, Confirmation, and viſiting the Sick. In other titles we have ſomething concerning eccleſiaſtical puniſhments, and excommunication.—But I ſee no names of any *Sects* mentioned.

Abroad, the followers of *Swenkfeldt* are ſaid to have ſet aſide all external ordinances, in favour[g] of internal revelations; which is like what the *Quakers* have done ſince the time of Oliver Cromwell[h]: the pretext uſed was, that Sacraments are *Judaical*.

Mr. Gloſter Ridley, in his Life of Biſhop Ridley[i], tells us ſomething of the Sects alluded to. The *Anabaptiſts* and others, through abhorrence of the Romiſh worſhip of the *Hoſtia*, and the Lutheran high notions of the Sacrament, ran ſo far into the oppoſite extreme, as to uſe low and ſcurrilous expreſſions concerning it; and to fix up Bills, or papers, againſt the door of St. Paul's Cathedral, containing ſuch expreſſions.

We

[f] Reform. Leg. de Hæreſibus, cap. 17.—See alſo in Syntagma confeſſionum, the Confeſſions, or Articles, of Augſburg, and Scotland, and Switzerland, page 61. 96. 153. And in the ſecond Part, page 15.

[g] See Rogers on the Article, page 153.

[h] Moſheim, Index, *Quakers*.—Bennet's Confutation of Quakeriſm.—Barclay's Apology, Prop. 11. Sect. 2.

[i] Life of Biſhop Ridley, page 216.

We have, in Strype's[k] Life of Archbiſhop Whitgift, a paper ſigned by one Anthony *Randall*, Miniſter of Lydford, of the *Family of Love*, dated May 31, 1581, containing the aſſertion for which he was deprived by the Biſhop of Exeter: amongſt other things it is ſaid, "He never thought the Lord's Supper and Baptiſm to be Sacraments, becauſe he had not read the word Sacrament in the Holy Scripture. He alloweth the Adminiſtration of Sacraments becauſe the Magiſtrate hath eſtabliſhed it."

I will conclude this Hiſtory of Sacraments in general with mentioning, that the *Socinians* allow[l] but *one* ceremonial præceptum of Chriſt, to break bread:—how this is to be obeyed, will beſt appear hereafter.

III. Having finiſhed our Hiſtory of the Sacraments taken collectively, we come to make ſome hiſtorical remarks on thoſe *five*, taken ſeparately, which we reject. Theſe five ſtill remain intereſting to us, though we reject them as Sacraments, becauſe they are changed into *offices* which we eſteem to be of great importance. *Confirmation*, *Abſolution*. *Ordination*, *Matrimony*, and *Viſitation of the Sick:* a right knowledge of theſe has a great tendency to make the *paſtoral* duties uſeful to the public, as well as comfortable, or pleaſing, to the Paſtor himſelf.

Firſt of *Confirmation*. In the primitive age of Chriſtianity it appeared to the generality of thinking Chriſtians, that Baptiſm included ideas both of *water* and the [m]*Holy Spirit*. John iii. 5.—Titus iii. 5. of which more hereafter. Perſons of inferior rank

[k] Strype's Whitgift, Appendix, page 93.

[l] Racov. Catechiſm, page 143.

[m] Cave's Hiſt. Lit. T. 1. page 131. 2. Anon. de Baptiſmo non iterando, A. D. 253.

rank in the miniſtry, were competent to baptize with *water*, but it was obſervable that thoſe of the *higheſt*[n] *rank* made uſe of *prayer* and *impoſition* of hands for the obtaining of the *Holy Ghoſt*; and it was granted to their petitions. It ſhewed itſelf at firſt in ſome *ſupernatural* effects, otherwiſe the grant might have been incredible; but the *Comforter* was to be ſent to Chriſtians in all ages; to guide them into all truth, to reprove[o] and inſpire them, to work in them both to will[p] and to do: yet he was to be aſked[q] for; what more natural *mode* of calling down the Holy Spirit could be adopted, when his gifts became *ordinary*, than one which was ſome *imitation* of the mode uſed by authority when they were *extraordinary*[r]?—It ſuits this account, when *Jerom* calls what has now the name of *confirmation*, by the terms *imprecatio*, and *invocatio* ſpiritûs ſancti. —"Non abnuo hanc eſſe Eccleſiarum conſuetudinem, ut ad eos qui longè in minoribus urbibus per preſbyteros et *Diaconos baptizati* ſunt, *Epiſcopus*, ad *invocationem* ſancti Spiritus manum impoſiturus, excurrat." Dial. contra Lucifer. cap. 4.—And a little after, "Alioquin, ſi *Epiſcopi* tantùm *imprecatione*, Spiritus Sanctus defluit, lugendi ſunt qui in villulis, aut in Caſtellis, aut in remotioribus locis, per Preſbyteros aut *Diaconos* baptizati, ante dormierunt

[n] The authorities ſeem well collected in *Wheatly* on Common Prayer, Confirmation – beginning, page 397, 398.——In *Cornelius's* caſe, Acts x. 47. The Holy Ghoſt *precedes* Baptiſm, and is the *cauſe* of baptizing.

[o] John xvi. 8. 13. [p] Phil. ii. 13.

[q] Lnke xi. 13.—See alſo 2 Cor. i. 21, and parallels.—And 1 John ii. 27. might be conſidered.

[r] Whatever is in *Scripture* muſt be in an age of *Miracles*; but according to our reaſoning about the difference between a firſt *miniſtry* and an eſtabliſhed one, we might conclude with regard to any particular ordinance.—See Art. XXIII. Sect. XXV.

dormierunt, quam ab *Epiſcopis* inviſerentur." The latter paſſage refers to caſes of *neceſſity*[s]

When Churches increaſed, a *ceremony* would be wanted. *Unction* would readily occur, as ſuited to notions of Jews[t], and Gentiles, and to many climates where Chriſtianity was profeſſed. How ſoon it was uſed in what we call *Confirmation*, is not agreed: ſome learned men think very ſoon; but Bingham[u] does not allow any proof of it before the time of Tertullian: however, we may look upon this ceremony as arbitrary, ariſing from particular circumſtances, and therefore as one, which may be *omitted*, though enjoined by the Council of Laodicea, in the year 367.

Some ſcholaſtic writers own, that confirmation as a Sacrament, was not inſtituted by Chriſt, or uſed by the Apoſtles; but that it was made a Sacrament at the concilium Meldenſe[x]: Cave mentions two; one in 845, the other in 1201;—but he ſays nothing of Confirmation in his account of either.

One of the Scholaſtic writers was the famous Alexander *Hales*, the Doctor Irrefragabilis of our own country; called in Latin Alexander[y] *Alenſis*. —The *matter* and *form* were diſtinctly expreſſed by Pope Eugenius IV. in the Council of Florence, in the year 1438.

It would ſeem very doubtful how ſoon Confirmation ſhould *follow Baptiſm*. In the Baptiſm of

[s] Theſe paſſages are quoted by Bingham, 12. 1. 1.

[t] Exod. xxx. 22.—Pſalm cxxxiii. 2.—1 John ii. 20. 27.—See alſo Pearſon on Creed, Art. 2. beginning, &c. page 80. 93. And for Gentiles, page 99, folio.

[u] Bingham's Antiquities, 12. 3. 2.

[x] Conſilium Meldenſe was the Council of *Meaux*.—See Bingham's Index of Councils. Ant. Vol. 2. page 519.

[y] Forbes, 9. 4. 4. and Cave calls him Alexander *de* Hales.

of Adults the ſooner the better; delay would only be owing to the neceſſary avocations of thoſe ſuperior miniſters, who were to confirm; that is of Biſhops[z].—In caſe of Infant-baptiſm there would be more difficulty; thoſe who thought that the Euchariſt ſhould be adminiſtered to Infants, would be for having Confirmation follow Baptiſm immediately; but others would wiſh to have Confirmation deferred till any one was fit to have been baptized as an Adult. This diſtinction between adults and infants, is not marked out ſo plainly as might be wiſhed[a]. In caſes of infant-baptiſm it is probable, that the neceſſity of confirmation muſt have appeared particularly ſtrong, as obviating objections incident to a contract, in which a contracting party had not perfect underſtanding[b].

The *name* of confirmation was not common in ancient times. Cyprian[c] uſes *conſummation*, or the verb *conſummate*, but not as a technical term. The Greeks had different names; but I will ſpeak of the Greeks ſeparately.

The Greek Chriſtians uſe unction in confirming: the ointment is made by the Patriarch or Biſhop alone, on the Thurſday in Paſſion-week, of precious ingredients, and with a ſacred apparatus; it is uſed for ſome other purpoſes, but chiefly for confirmation; which always, in the Greek Church, follows Baptiſm immediately. It has the names of Χρισμα, unction; Χειροθεσια, impoſition of hands; and σφραγις, the ſign or ſeal of the Lord. In the Ευχολογιον, or Greek ritual, there is an Office, called the Office of the Holy ointment, or Ακολυθια

τε

[z] See authorities from the Ancients, Bingham, 12. 1. 1.

[a] However, ſee Bingham, 12. 1. 2.

[b] This is confirmed by Limborch, 5. 77. 3.

[c] Cave's Diſſertation under μυρον ſays, that Cyprian uſes the word Conſummation *non ſemel*.

τȣ ἁγιȣ μυρȣ, where are the ceremonies and prayers, and the mode of preparation. The veſſel in which this ointment is contained, has the name of ἁγιον τȣ μεγαλȣ μυρȣ. But the Greeks do not call confirmation a *ſacrament* ordained by Chriſt[d].

The *Romiſh* notion of Confirmation is eaſily collected from the acts of the Council of Trent, and the Catechiſm compoſed by order of that Council. In the ſeventh Seſſion of the Council there ſeem only to be three Canons on the ſubject, without any argumentation: the firſt declares Confirmation to be a proper Sacrament, and not a mere ceremony, or catechetical examination. The ſecond condemns thoſe who allow no virtue to the Chriſm. The third ſays, that not every Prieſt, but only a Biſhop, can confirm; ordinarily. In addition, we find in the Catechiſm, the form of words made uſe of; "I ſign thee with the ſign of the Croſs, and confirm thee with the *Chriſm* of Salvation. In the name of," &c. It is alſo affirmed, contrary to the Schoolmen here mentioned, that Chriſt was "the *author*" of this Sacrament, and "appointed the Rite of *Chriſm*, and the *words* which the Holy Church uſes," &c. The authority for this aſſertion is not *Scripture*, but the ſecond Epiſtle of S. *Fabian*[e], Biſhop of Rome: which is ſufficient to thoſe that believe Confirmation to be a Sacrament, becauſe all ſacraments are myſteries, "above the reach of human nature, nor can they be inſtituted by any but by God himſelf." As curious an inſtance of reaſoning in a circle, as you ſhall meet with. This Catechiſm proceeds to inform us, that the *matter* of this ſacrament is *Chriſm*; the

[d] This is chiefly from Cave's Diſſertation, under Μυρον: ſee alſo Bingham, 12. 1. 1.

[e] Cave mentions no ſuch Eccleſ. writer.—Ladvocat places him in 236.

the *Form* was given before; that one confirmed ought to have a *Godfather*, as a "*Monitor*," a "*Captain*," a "*fencing-maſter*;" for he has now put on the whole armour of God; but that there muſt be no *marriage* with this fencing-maſter: that confirmation is not to be given till young perſons have "the uſe of *Reaſon*," and *therefore* it muſt be deferred till they are *eleven* years old, or however till they are[f] *ſix*: that Confirmation gives ſpiritual *ſtrength*, as appeared from the conduct of St. Peter, who deſerted his cauſe *before* the deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on the great day of Pentecoſt, but *after* it ſuffered with conſtancy.

The Catechiſm lays down, that Confirmation is one of thoſe Sacraments which imprint a χαραχτηρ, as before-mentioned, and *concludes* with explaining the parts of the Romiſh ceremony; the unction why on the forehead; the ſign of the Croſs, the *blow* ſtruck by the Biſhop on the breaſt[g], the giving of the *Pax*[h]. The taking of *Whitſuntide* for a feſtival or ſeaſon of Confirmation, may be underſtood from what was juſt now ſaid of St. Peter.

I ſhould imagine that *Preſbyterians* have no confirmation, (though they have Penance, Ordination, Matrimony, and Viſitation of the ſick) as I ſee nothing relating to it in their *Directory*, or in their

[f] The Biſhop of Lincoln, at his Viſitation, 1791, deſired that none might be brought to be confirmed under fourteen years of age; which, I think, agrees with Archbiſhop Secker. See his Sermon at the end of his Lectures on the Catechiſm.

[g] Wheatly ſays, on the *cheek*, page 410.—Limborch calls it *alapa*.

[h] A Paten which ſerves for the top of a Chalice, which is given by the adminiſtering Prieſt to the aſſiſtant Prieſt to kiſs, juſt before the offering; ſo I underſtand the French Dictionary of the Academy.

their Form of Church-Government[i]; and as it is rejected in the Helvetic confeſſion: — yet the objections made by the Puritans, as deſcribed by Neal[k], do not ſeem ſufficient to juſtify a total abolition; being only, that children *might* come too young to the Euchariſt, and that an expreſſion in our Biſhop's Prayer has an appearance of aſcribing a *ſacramental* effect to the Inſtitution.— Yet Puritans uſed infant-baptiſm.

Thoſe who ſet aſide Confirmation, muſt conceive both water and ſpirit to have their full effect in *Baptiſm.* The Helvetic confeſſion ſays, *Confirmatio et extrema unctio* inventa ſunt hominum, quibus nullo cum damno carere poteſt Eccleſia. Neque illa nos in noſtris Eccleſiis habemus; nam habent illa quædam quæ minimè probare poſſumus.

The Church of *England* retains the office of Confirmation; and confines it to the *Biſhop*; it cloſely imitates the Apoſtles in uſing no Chriſm, only prayer and impoſition of hands.—It defers the ordinance till young perſons are arrived at years of diſcretion, that they may themſelves ratify their baptiſmal covenants. It does not conſider confirmation as a Sacrament; the reaſon will beſt come into our Proof. In *Theory* it uſes a *Godfather*, as a *witneſs*; but not in *practice.*

The *Baptiſts* are ſaid to be much divided on the uſe of Confirmation[l]: Inſomuch that thoſe who have held confirmation to be a neceſſary qualification for the Lord's Supper, have ſeparated themſelves,

[i] Publiſhed in Append. to Neal's Hiſtory of Puritans.

[k] Vol. 1. page 159, quarto.

[l] Wheatly ſpeaks on this ſubject; ſee his Work on the Common Prayer, page 406. Alſo Wall on Infant Baptiſm, page 447, quarto; or 2. 8. 6. 15. I do not perceive that the Confeſſion of Augſburg declares anything concerning it.

ſelves, in celebrating that ordinance, from thoſe who have held the oppoſite opinion.

An incident mentioned in the accounts of the Hampton-Court conference, may lead us to what may, in fact, have been the principal difficulty relating to Confirmation.—That difficulty might be thus expreſſed; 'If confirmation be neceſſary, is not *Baptiſm imperfect?*' King James the Firſt, who might be prejudiced, as a Scotchman, in favour of the Scotch Church, expreſſed a ſcruple of this ſort, but Archbiſhop Bancroft, "on his knees replied, that the Church did not hold Baptiſm imperfect without Confirmation;" that "it was of Apoſtolical inſtitution, Heb. vi. 2. where it is called the doctrine of the *laying*[m] *on* of hands." —Indeed in that place (taking in the preceding verſe) it ſeems deſcribed as one of the fundamental *principles* of Chriſtianity, and as following Baptiſm. —With regard to the difficulty, it is of a ſort which often occurs amidſt the imperfections of human tranſactions. King James might have recollected, that the acceſſion of a King is completed by *Coronation:* I ſuppoſe that if a King purpoſely neglected or refuſed to take the coronation-oaths, his neglect might ſhake his title to the Crown; but if, without any culpable neglect, it happened, that he was not crowned till he had begotten a ſon, and was to die, ſuch poſthumous ſon would probably inherit as if the acceſſion was complete.

Baptiſm then may be complete without confirmation, if confirmation is not to be had; and yet confirmation may be requiſite when it can be had.—This ſeems to agree with the two ſentences lately quoted from Jerom.

IV. But

[m] Neal, Vol. 1. quarto, page 412.

IV. But we muſt now proceed to the ſecond Romiſh Sacrament which we reject, viz. *Penance*. —A good deal was ſaid on the efficacy of Repentance under the ſixteenth Article[n]; I will endeavour not to run into repetition. It ſeems as if we could not ſtir a ſtep without diſtinguiſhing *private* repentance from penance conſidered as a part of eccleſiaſtical *diſcipline*; though the Latin word *pœnitentia* may ſtand for both. Peter Lombard ſpeaks, as do others, of pœnitentia *exterior* as oppoſed[o] to *interior*. His idea might be the ſame with ours: private repentance is viſible only to God; whereas penance is viſible to the Church, and may be conſidered as ſome evil undergone in order to avoid *excommunication:* yet though theſe two ought to be kept diſtinct in the mind, they ſometimes run into one another. A private man may be guided in his repentance by a miniſter of the Church, as it might, without ſome regulation, be too light or too deſperate; and a perſon under eccleſiaſtical cenſure, or penance, may inwardly repent; and his penance may be, and is meant to be, the occaſion of his repentance. Alſo a private penitent may impoſe penance upon *himſelf*, or even apply to the Church to impoſe it upon him; independent of any reſtitution or compenſation which he may think it right to make.

Whatever relates to Penance, properly ſo called, ſhould be deferred till we treat of the thirty-third Article: the Romiſh *Sacrament* ſeems to me to relate to private repentance, as conducted and regulated by a Miniſter of the Church; but let us proceed in order.

Before we come to the Romiſh Church, let us juſt take notice of the Greek Μετανοια. It was a part

[n] Art. XVI. Sect. I. II. III. XVIII. XXXII. XXXIII.
[o] See Forbes, 9. 5. 19.

part of the Ευχολογιον before mentioned, and itſelf conſiſted of many parts; amongſt others we find the following mentioned in[p] Cave.

1. Ευχη επι μετανοουντων, a prayer over the penitents;

2. Ακολυθια των εξομολογουμενων, an Office for thoſe who confeſs.

3. Ευχη επι των επιτιμιων λυομενων, a prayer over thoſe who are abſolved from Penance.

4. Ακολυθια εις λυσιν αφορισμυ ἱερεως, a ſervice for diſſolving the excommunication of the Prieſt; containing, as I underſtand, many prayers.

From the Greek Church we[q] are told, that the firſt penitentiary formularies were brought into the Latin, by one of the name of *Theodorus*, who was of *Tarſus*, a Monk, and afterwards, in the year 668, an inhabitant of England, and Archbiſhop of Canterbury.

That the Romiſh Sacrament of Penance is moſt properly an authoritative regulation of *private* repentance, will appear from dividing it into its conſtituent parts. Theſe are *Contrition*, *Confeſſion*, *Satisfaction*, *Abſolution*.—But the whole is ſometimes called by the name of a part. Our Homily[r] on Common Prayer and Sacraments, ſeems to mean the whole by the word *Abſolution*; and that word is uſed in the ſame ſenſe in the Neceſſary Doctrine[s], and in the works of Duns Scotus[t].—And the *Form* of the *Sacrament* is, according to the Trent Catechiſm, "*I abſolve thee*;"—though indeed the *matter* is ſaid to be Contrition and Confeſſion, and Satisfaction[u].

"*Contrition*

[p] Hiſt. Lit. Diſſert. page 31. [q] Cave, 1. 593.
[r] Homilies, 8vo. page 276.
[s] Nec. Doctr. is not paged: near the begin. of Penance.
[t] See Forbes, 9. 5. 26.
[u] Trent Catech. on Penance, Sect. 17, 19. page 245. Engl.

"*Contrition* is the grief of the ſoul, and a deteſtation of ſin committed, with a purpoſe to ſin no more for the time[x] to come."—Its place is ſometimes ſupplied by what is called *Attrition*, which is ſometimes defined imperfect contrition; the difference ſeems to be, that Contrition is grief for ſin *as ſin*; or *moral* ſorrow and abhorrence: attrition is grief for ſin as producing bad *conſequences*; one might call it *prudential* ſorrow and abhorrence; however, if this latter turns the *will* from ſin, it is deemed efficacious.

Attrition is called by its *name* in the fourteenth Seſſion of the Council of Trent, Chap. 4. but the naming of it ſeems ſometimes to be *avoided*; it is well and artfully *deſcribed* in the fifth Canon of the ſame Seſſion, but not named; neither do I ſee it named in the Trent Catechiſm, though it is deſcribed in Sect. 37.

The next part of the Romiſh Sacrament of Penance, is *Confeſſion:* the word *auricular* is generally added to Confeſſion, in order to diſtinguiſh it from public and general confeſſion, ſuch as we open our Service with (after a ſhort ſentence or two and an Exhortation to confeſs;) and becauſe it is made in the *ear* of an inviſible Prieſt[y].

Biſhop

[x] Ibid. Sect. 30, or page 250.

[y] The French Dictionary of the Academy ſays, the confeſſional is commonly *ſhut*; and that two penitents kneel at one time on different ſides; theſe penitents cannot be ſuppoſed to communicate with each other: and I have underſtood, that the Prieſt is not ſeen during Confeſſion: or not always. To confeſs, in French, often means to confeſs a *Penitent*; that is, to receive his confeſſion: conſequently the Prieſt, who confeſſes penitents, is a Confeſſor: but in Engliſh to confeſs, always means to confeſs *ſins;* ſo that the penitent would be the confeſſor in Engliſh, keeping up the analogy; but we rightly comply with Popiſh expreſſions in Popiſh buſineſs.

Biſhop Porteus[z] ſays, as to "private confeſſion in all caſes, it was never thought of as a command of God, for 900 years after Chriſt; nor determined to be ſuch till after 1200:" whereas the Council of Trent[a] ſay, "a ſanctiſſimis et *antiquiſſimis* Patribus, magno *unanimique* conſenſu, ſecreta Confeſſio ſacramentalis, qua *ab initio* Eccleſia ſancta uſa eſt, et modò etiam utitur, [fuerit] *ſemper* commendata."

The oppoſition here ſeems ſtrong; yet Bingham does[b] a good deal towards reconciling the contending parties, by obſerving, that though there were, in ancient times, ſeveral ſorts of confeſſion in ſome ſenſe private, and though there was ſuch an Office as that of penitentiary Prieſt, yet private negotiations had always relation to public diſcipline, and made a part of it; notwithſtanding ſome things might be occaſionally concealed, for fear of ſcandalizing weak brethren.

I have already obſerved, that the private penitent might be deſirous to ſubmit his offence to the Church, in order that he ſhould be properly puniſhed, in this life; neither too ſlightly nor too ſeverely: and this ſeems no unwiſe plan to gain ſatisfaction and peace of mind: now this was the very buſineſs in which Penitentiary Prieſts were employed. And we may ſee, that ſuch a plan would make private penitence and church-diſcipline coincide; or at leaſt would form an intimate connexion between them. In the whole affair of Penitence, the great difference between ancient and modern times ſeems to lie in this; that in ancient times

[z] Brief Confutation, page 47.—See alſo Comber's Advice, page 16.

[a] Seſſ. 14. Cap. 5.

[b] Bingham, 18. 3. 11.—See alſo Wheatly on the Common Prayer, page 459.

times private repentance was more intimately connected with church-diſcipline, than in modern.

The ἐξομολογησις of the ancients (taken from James v. 16.) Bingham ſhews to mean the whole of public confeſſion and Penance, conſidered as eccleſiaſtical diſcipline.

Daillé has written a very good Book on auricular Confeſſion; the contents of which may be found in Bingham, 18. 3. 4. which are well worth reading; but I would wiſh any one not by any means to excuſe himſelf, if he is ſeriouſly ſtudying the ſubject of Confeſſion, from reading the concluſion of the third chapter of Bingham's eighteenth Book.

In the Romiſh church, *young* perſons are called upon to confeſs. The Trent Catechiſm mentions this, and deſcribes the very humble[c] poſture in which Confeſſion is made; it alſo mentions, that confeſſion muſt be *unreſerved*; of evil thoughts, words and actions; or of offences againſt the *tenth* commandment, as well as againſt the other nine. It ſets forth the proviſions which are made for the *ſecurity* of the Penitent who opens[d] his heart: yet *Comber* ſhews, that[e] ſome caſes have diſpenſation for divulging ſecrets: as when a fault concerns the Church: this muſt give great latitude.

It ſeems ſtrange that ſo much ſtreſs ſhould be laid upon confeſſion, and yet that it ſhould be inſiſted on by the Church only *once*[f] *a year:* could any one make a confeſſion of all the ſins, in thought, word and deed, which he had committed during a whole year?

Whatever

[c] Page 261, Sect. 56.—See alſo Dict. Acad. Confeſſional.
[d] Sect. 64, and 74. [e] Advice, page 37.
[f] Trent Catechiſm, Sect. 59.—French Prayer-book, page 16. "Les commandemens de l' Egliſe."

Whatever good ſome kinds of private confeſſion might do, yet the Romiſh is ſaid to have been in fact productive of much evil. This is deſcribed by Sir Edwin Sandys[g]: Comber[h] and Benſon[i] ſpeak of the evil reſulting from the Clergy knowing the thoughts of men's hearts.—Indeed if we conſider, that among ſuch a numerous body as the Clergy ſome may be expected to be vicious and corrupt, we ſhall be ſhocked at the thoughts of their being intruſted with ſecrets capable of being turned to bad purpoſes.—Yet the Romaniſts ſeem ſtill to value private confeſſion as much as any part of their religion[k].

To me it ſeems, that private confeſſion, under eccleſiaſtical *Laws*, is bad even in *theory*; that is, miſchievous not through mere *abuſe*; at leaſt not through any abuſe but ſuch as muſt be expected. —Why not confeſs to God himſelf? to lean on inferior confidences, to be tried by narrow-minded judges, muſt tend to lower and debaſe the religious ſentiments; as was ſaid of worſhipping Saints and Angels; and muſt hinder a man from looking up to his heavenly Judge. And what can be expected from reducing indeterminate duties to determinate laws, but a mechanical religion, coldneſs and evaſion? What man pays with generous fervour what he is obliged to pay by law? What can be expected from requiring towards ſtrangers, or perſons of bad character, that confidence, thoſe effuſions of ſincerity and contrition, which every delicate mind reſerves for a few intimate friends, but hypocriſy

[g] Speculum Europæ, page 10.
[h] Advice, page 37. [i] On James v. 16.
[k] I collect this from what I heard an eminent Engliſh Lawyer of the Romiſh Church ſay, when he was ſolliciting an Act of Parliament for thoſe, who have ſince been called *proteſting Catholics*.

criſy or ſelf-deceit!—but our preſent buſineſs is *Hiſtory*.

The church of *England* may ſeem, from ſome things, to approach towards Romiſh Confeſſion: "Repentance," ſays Biſhop *Sparrow*[l], "conſiſts of three parts, as the Church teaches in the Commination; 1. *Contrition*, or lamenting of our ſinful lives; 2. Knowledging or *confeſſing* our ſins; 3. An endeavour to bring forth fruits worthy of Penance, which the ancients call *ſatisfaction:*" thus Biſhop Sparrow; and, of the fourth thing *abſolution*, the Church of England affords ſeveral inſtances.

Confeſſion, in ſome ſort private, is often commended[m] by our Divines, and even in our Liturgy: we may inſtance in the firſt Exhortation to the Communion, and in the Viſitation of the[n] Sick. —But, in the firſt place, let me obſerve, that I look upon it as always a mark of good ſenſe, when men are avoiding anything, not to do it raſhly, and through mere diſguſt; but to take every good they can find, though mixed with evil which they diſapprove:—In avoiding one extreme, it ſhews rational moderation, not to run precipitately into another.—And with regard to particular regulations, there is a great difference between requiring a conſtant, *ordinary* confeſſion of *all* ſins: and recommending it to an unhappy man, who wants much to unburthen his mind, in one or two extraordinary ſituations, and to have his difficulties ſolved; to apply to one, who muſt of courſe be better informed than himſelf, and may be ſuppoſed free from religious melancholy. The ordinary language of our Church is, "confeſs yourſelves to Almighty God," and it is found even in our firſt

[l] Rationale, page 17.
[m] Bingham, 18. 3.—Biſhop Porteus, page 46.
[n] See Wheatly, page 460.

firſt exhortation to the Communion; but when the mind is tormented with ſcruples, or debilitated by ſickneſs, advice is wanted: and the weak ſhould be "*moved*" to get over their reſerve, and ſolicit ſpiritual "comfort or counſel."

The real purpoſe of our Church, in quitting the laws of auricular confeſſion, and at the ſame time recommending ſome confidential intercourſe between a Miniſter and thoſe troubled in conſcience, was, probably, to throw off a yoke hard to be born; to give liberty where the ſenſible and delicate mind moſt longs for it; to ſubſtitute affectionate exhortation in the room of penal laws, and mechanical obſervances; and thereby prevent hypocriſy and evaſion; without diſſolving the paſtoral connexion and relation, or weakening the mutual confidence and mutual kindneſs between Miniſter and people.

The next part of the Romiſh Sacrament of Penance, after confeſſion, is *Satisfaction*. The Church of Rome ſeems deſirous to have the Penitent ſuffer ſomething in conſequence of his offences; ſeeing, probably, that ſome ſuffering would be good for him, and might be made profitable to the Church: But how to manage, is the difficulty; for the ſyſtem gives complete forgiveneſs to the penitent, even of mortal ſins, without ſuch ſuffering. It is therefore ſaid, that God is ſometimes ſpoken of as forgiving ſins, when thoſe who are forgiven, have ſome partial, temporary *puniſhment continued*; and that, in a Chriſtian, even after penance and abſolution, there are ſome *Embers*, as it were of ſin, ſome remains of vicious *habits*, from which *danger* is to be apprehended: both, then, for the continuance of ſome puniſhment, and for the counteracting of theſe remains of evil in the mind, it is judged proper to ſet ſome kind of *taſks* to the

the Penitent, to be performed after his Abſolution. —To this it is added, that when the Church has been witneſs to a man's offending, it ſhould be able, for its ſatisfaction, to ſee ſome ſufferings ſubmitted to as marks of amendment: and that ſuch marks will ſerve as a warning to others, and make them cautious of offending. Laſtly, it is laid down, that ſuch actions as are preſcribed as ſatisfactions, ought never to be intermitted.—The ſatisfactions enjoined by the Confeſſors, are to be *Prayer*, *Alms*, and *Faſting*; theſe having a reſpect to God, our neighbour, and ourſelves. But it is alſo held, that if *God* is pleaſed to inflict puniſhment himſelf, thoſe will be the ſame in effect as ſatisfactions enjoined by the Prieſt.—The quantum of Alms, &c. is to depend on circumſtances; as on the fortune of the offender, &c. like *damages* given by a Jury: this is truſting a good deal to Confeſſors.

It is held alſo, that "one can ſatisfy *for another*," —on account of the *communion of Saints*; with ſome *limitation*, which I do not underſtand°: indeed the whole of this ſatisfying by proxy is to me obſcure; —it anſwers ſome purpoſe, no doubt: indeed one can ſee that it tends to promote a circulation of wealth in the Church: but the *moral* good of it does not ſtrike me at preſent. Acts of mortification and ſelf-denial, undertaken in order to break and extirpate vicious habits, are right and reaſonable; but here they appear to diſadvantage by being cramped up in a bad ſyſtem.

The laſt part of the Romiſh Sacrament of Penance, is *abſolution*.—In order to have an idea even of the hiſtorical part of the ſubject, one muſt attend to the diſtinction between *miniſterial* and *judicial*:

° It means, I believe, that if a perſon ſatisfies for another, the benefit ariſing uſually to the *mind* of the penitent, is loſt.

judicial: a perſon gives *miniſterial* abſolution, when he acts as a *Miniſter* or *Agent*, under God as a principal; *judicial*, when he acts in the capacity of a *Judge*, from whom lies no appeal.—Nor can we proceed rightly without remarking here, that all judicial abſolution muſt conſiſt in releaſing offenders from puniſhments inflicted by religious ſociety amongſt *men*, or from Church cenſures: and that all anticipation of the day of Judgment, in abſolving, muſt be miniſterial; its end, to warm and comfort; though every deciſion of a miniſter or agent will undoubtedly be ratified, if the Agent acts in his proper[p] character, and is rightly informed; which he cannot be, except the repentance, in any caſe before him, be ſincere: and as he can only pronounce abſolution on ſuppoſition of ſincerity in his penitent, his abſolution muſt be, in ſome ſort, *conditional*. This premiſed, we proceed with our *Hiſtory*.

All Abſolution given in the Chriſtian Church to Chriſtians as individuals was at firſt miniſterial[q]: there was not for many centuries any mention of the Church claiming to forgive as God.—Though, in caſes of judicial abſolution from church cenſures, prayers were offered that God would forgive the offender, as the Church had done. The forms of abſolution which have been in uſe, are four: the *precatory*, the *optative*, the *indicative*, and the *declarative*; they differ as do the following expreſſions —'O God forgive this penitent;'—"*may* God pardon and deliver you from all your ſins;"—"I abſolve thee from all thy ſins;"—'God pardoneth all them that truly repent; wherefore, as I preſume, your repentance is ſincere, I adviſe you to be of

[p] Art. XXII. Sect. XVII.

[q] See Bingham, 19. 1. 1. &c, and Wheatly on the Common Prayer, page 465, &c.

of good comfort, and not to diſtruſt the divine mercy.' The moſt ancient of theſe forms was, I believe, the precatory; the optative is precatory as to its meaning: the indicative was not uſed till about the middle of the twelfth Century[r]; within a Century after that, the Prieſt's indicative abſolution was looked upon as equivalent to the forgiveneſs of God.

There is one exception to ancient forms being precatory, which comes ſo near the caſe of our abſolution in the Viſitation of the Sick, that it ſeems worth mentioning. Even in the primitive Church, we are told that the *clinical* abſolution[s], or abſolution given to perſons on a *ſick-bed*, was in the indicative form: only certain religious exerciſes were enjoined in caſe of recovery, which, when the abſolution was given, it was taken for granted would be faithfully performed. Perhaps it might be thought, that as perſons on a ſick-bed are apt to be dejected, and their dejection is apt to increaſe their diſorder, that form ſuited them beſt, which was calculated to inſpire the greateſt confidence[t].

The Romiſh notions of abſolution are to be found, as before, in the Acts of the Council of Trent, and in the Trent Catechiſm. The Rhemiſh Teſtament might carry us into too great length.—It was in the fourteenth Seſſion, that the ſubject was treated: we find it mentioned in the ſixth chapter and the ninth Canon: the wiſh of the Council ſeems to be, to declare even private abſolution judicial; but the difficulties are ſo ſtriking,

[r] Wheatly, page 467.

[s] See Dr. Marſhall's Penitential Diſcipline, page 104, quoted by Wheatly, page 468.

[t] On this ſubject we find recommended, Archbiſhop *Uſher's* Anſwer to the Jeſuit's challenge; and Dr. *Marſhall's Penitential Diſcipline*.

ſtriking, that they are obliged to ſoften the expreſſions. However, in the Canon the matter ſtands thus; any one is to be anathematized if he ſays, "Abſolutionem *ſacramentalem* ſacerdotis, non eſſe actum *judicialem*, ſed nudum *miniſterium* pronunciandi et *declarandi* remiſſa eſſe peccata," &c. —Where I can conceive ſome *evaſion* to be derivable from the word *ſacramentalem*; for any man who believes there is ſuch a thing as *ſacramental* abſolution, will believe it to be *judicial*; and what is affirmed is affirmed of no other.—But in the Chapter, we have ſtill greater caution; the abſolution of the Prieſt is owned to be, *alieni* beneficii diſpenſatio; it is called, ad *inſtar* actus judicialis. —In the[u] *Catechiſm*, made for the inſtruction of the *People*, we find, that when the Prieſt uſes the words, *Ego te abſolvo*, he pronounces that the ſinner *has* obtained from *God* the Pardon of his Sins.—Nay this is ſaid of a penitent who has not confeſſed, but only has had the *wiſh* of Confeſſion; though by the ninth canon any one is anathematized who ſhall ſay, non *requiri* Confeſſionem Penitentis, ut Sacerdos eum abſolvere poſſit.—In ſome caſes, ſtill farther relaxation is allowed: for the Prieſt is directed to abſolve his penitents, if he only finds, that diligence in reckoning up ſins, and grief in deteſting them, have not been "*altogether wanting*."

We come, in the laſt place, to Abſolution as it is practiſed in the Church of *England*.—Our Church uſes three of the four forms already mentioned; the declaratory near the beginning of the ſervice; the optative, which is in ſenſe precatory, in the communion; and the indicative in the viſitation of the ſick. But Biſhop Sparrow rightly obſerves,

[u] On Penance, Sect. xix. page 246.

obſerves[x], that "theſe ſeveral Forms, in ſence and virtue are the ſame;" and illuſtrates his obſervation by the inſtance of a Prince commiſſioning an Officer to ſet at liberty all well-diſpoſed Priſoners: it ſeems immaterial which form of words he uſes. The indicative form was once, by the Rubric in the office of viſiting the ſick, directed to be uſed in all[y] private confeſſions when men had ſcruples of conſcience; but now, in the firſt exhortation to the Communion, though abſolution is promiſed to the ſcrupulous, the form of it ſeems to be left to the Prieſt, only it is ſhewn to be miniſterial; and to be built, not ſo much on private judgment, as on "God's holy word."

I will cloſe this account of Abſolution, with obſerving, that though our expreſſion in abſolving the ſick, "I abſolve thee from all thy ſins," ſounds as if the abſolution were purely indicative; yet, if we take all the expreſſions of the form at once into our minds, we muſt perceive, that the abſolution is expreſsly called miniſterial; and that it is alſo declarative, and optative; and therefore, that the concluding expreſſion cannot be rightly underſtood but as conſiſtent with thoſe forms to which no member of the Church of England objects.

Having now gone through the four parts, we may conclude by taking notice, that in the Romiſh Sacrament of Penance, the *matter* is, the part of the *Penitent*, (Contrition, Confeſſion, Satisfaction); the *Form* is, the part of the *Prieſt*; Ego te abſolvo.

In the *Directory* of the Preſbyterians I do not ſee Abſolution mentioned; but the Miniſter is to *comfort*

[x] Rationale, page 19.

[y] See King Edward's firſt Liturgy, Rubric in the Viſitation of the Sick. Or Wheatly on Common Prayer, page 469.

comfort the ſick, to *declare* God's mercy to penitents, to hinder the indiſpoſed from being too much caſt down, &c.—and in caſe of *ſcruple*, "inſtructions and *reſolutions* ſhall be given to ſatisfy and ſettle him."

v. The next Romiſh Sacrament, after Penance, which we reject, is *Orders:* but on this we need not dwell very long. Indeed our principal concern is with the Romiſh Church, as we have already, under the twenty-third Article, given ſome account of church-miniſters in general; and as we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of the Engliſh Ordinations in particular under the thirty-ſixth Article.—However, if any particulars occur, which have not been mentioned before, and which throw any light upon the Romiſh Orders, they may be admitted.

Bingham gives[z] an account of ſeveral ſorts of Miniſters in the ancient churches, which in our church are not uſed. As *Deaconeſſes*, that is, elderly widows, attending on Baptiſm and other offices relating to *females*. *Subdeacons*, ὑπηρεται, aſſiſtants to Deacons, &c. in the ceremonies of the Church; a ſort of agents or meſſengers, and at the ſame time Pupils, to the Biſhops. —*Acolythiſts*, (or Acolyths, or Acolytes) attendants for lighting candles, and providing wine for the Euchariſts.—*Exorciſts*, whoſe buſineſs it was to attend the Ενεργουμενοι, or Demoniacs, or poſſeſſed, and pray with them. This office of Exorciſts ſeems ſtrange to us, nor do I perfectly know the nature of the diſorders under which the Energumens laboured, and were conceived to labour: religious fervours have frequently diſordered the intellects, eſpecially in a new religion, when oppoſed by friends

[z] Bingham, 3. 3.

friends who could raiſe the affections, and occaſion great agitation in the mind: in the plans of ancient churches we ſee, that two ſides of the cloyſters of the outward court were occupied by theſe energumens[a]. — As to the Exorciſt's driving away the unclean ſpirit at *Baptiſm*, that might be partly emblematical; and partly owing to the notions of men not free from ſuperſtitious weakneſs, concerning the nature and end of that Inſtitution.

There were alſo, in the ancient churches, *Readers*, who read the ſcriptures aloud in ſome elevated place or reading deſk: all theſe were probably in training for higher offices. Even the *Oſtiarii*, or doorkeepers, had a kind of ordination from the Biſhop, as far as that name could be applied to a ceremony of ſolemnly delivering to them the *Keys* of all the ſacred things with which they were to be entruſted[b]. — Beſides theſe, there were *Catechiſts*, and ſeveral inferior clerical Officers; but I need not deſcribe any more: indeed there is no end of the different modes in which men may worſhip God; and ſcarcely any of the different officers who may be employed in very large religious aſſemblies, where the ceremonies are complicated and conducted with a magnificence calculated to ſtrike the eye and warm the imagination.

Cave, in the alphabetical Diſſertation beforementioned, has an article Χειροτονια, or office for *ordaining* different clerical miniſters. He informs us, that the *Oſtiarius*, *Exorciſt*[c], and *Acolythiſt*, are not

[a] Frontiſpiece to Wheatly on the Common Prayer. I have been concerned with ſeveral perſons who would have occupied a place in one of theſe Cloyſters. While the Goſpel was ſpreading, moſt, or many mad people would take a religious turn.

[b] The *Oſtiarii* were not conſidered as Laymen.

[c] When the diſordered in mind were not ſuppoſed to want *prayer*, &c. one who had the care of them would only be like a keeper

not now held clerical in the Greek Church: but that there are rituals in the Euchologion for ordaining Biſhop, Prieſt, Deacon, Subdeacon, Reader, &c. He mentions *Morinus* as a learned writer on ſuch ſubjects.

The Romiſh church try to keep up a connection between the ideas of Prieſthood and *Sacrifice*, with a view to their maſs. They have five orders below that of Deacons; which are enumerated in the twenty-third Seſſion of the Council[d] of Trent; Subdeacons, Acolythiſts, Exorciſts, Readers, and Door-keepers. Theſe are the ſame *names* which we have found in ancient churches; but we are informed, even by Cardinal Bona, that, in reality, the ancient offices had ceaſed in his time; and that the perſons called by theſe names, were chiefly *boys*, and men *hired*, but initiated by no[e] kind of *Ordination*.

In the acts of the ſame Council, *Order* is declared to be a proper *Sacrament*, inſtituted *by Chriſt*; but the *unction*, though declared requiſite, does not ſeem to be expreſsly called the matter of the Sacrament; impoſition of hands is mentioned, and the Grace of God; but only from the Epiſtle to Timothy: and no ſcriptural Form of words is produced.—Order is ſaid to be one of thoſe ſacraments[f] which impreſs an indelible χαρακτηρ.

In the Trent *Catechiſm* the proof that Order is a proper ſacrament, ſeems[g] very lame: it informs us, however, that by the *ſhaving* of the crown, an entrance is opened into the Sacrament of Order, and

a keeper of a mad-houſe: he need not have any ſpiritual or clerical character.

[d] Cap. 2.

[e] 1. 25. 18. Bona, Rer. Liturg.—Quoted by Bingham, 3. 3. end.

[f] Sect. XI. [g] Sect. XX.

and that the ſhaven *circle grows* with eccleſiaſtical dignity. It alſo ſets forth "the dignity of door-keepers[h];" gives us the uſual forms, by which they and other inferior Clerks are ordained, or appointed: and mentions, that *Baſtards* and perſons *deformed*, are diſqualified for Ordination.

It ſeems reaſonable that there ſhould be a number of eccleſiaſtical officers in any place, proportioned to the greatneſs of the congregations in that place, and to the number and grandeur of the ceremonies. In our Cathedrals we have Precentors, &c. which we have not in our inferior churches; not to mention Vergers.

VI. We now come to the Romiſh Sacrament of *Matrimony*; but of this ſome Hiſtory has already been given[i] under the twenty-third Article: We need only ſpeak of Romiſh Matrimony and our own.

The Council of Trent declares[k] Matrimony to be a ſacrament inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf, but mentions neither *matter* nor *form*; nor uſes any argument, that I ſhould call ſuch, beſides that paſſage[l] of the Vulgate, erunt duo in carne unâ. *Sacramentum* hoc magnum eſt.—It ſeems[m] there have been great diſputes amongſt the Romaniſts whether *all* marriages could come under the notion of a Sacrament.—The Church of Rome is not only againſt *Polygamy* but *Divorces*. As Matrimony is with them a Sacrament, it is *indiſſoluble*; not that it is one of thoſe which ſtamp a χαρακτηρ, becauſe, though indiſſoluble for life, it may be diſſolved by death: nor is it inconſiſtent with *ſepa-*

ration,

[h] Sect xxxi. Margin. [i] Art. XXIII. Sect. XII.

[k] Seſſion 24.

[l] Eph. v. 31, 32. See Sect. II. of this Article, about Sacramentum.

[m] See Limborch's Theology, 5. 77. end.

ration, a mensâ et toro; but only with divorces ſtrictly ſo called; a vinculo matrimonii. Yet any marriage not conſummated, is diſſoluble by one of the parties going into a Convent or Monaſtery, or entering into any religious order. The prohibitions and diſqualifications, from conſanguinity, &c. are numerous; more ſo than thoſe in Leviticus; and the Romiſh Church claims a power of adding; but eaſe is to be procured by means of *Diſpenſations*. Now the greater ſtrictneſs there is, the more frequently muſt diſpenſations be ſued for.—I will only obſerve farther, on Romiſh Matrimony, a ſeeming ſingularity; I mean, that an inſtitution ſhould be deemed a ſacrament only by thoſe, who moſt commend abſtaining from it!—to commend abſtinence from a *ſacrament*, would appear to us ſomewhat ſtrange.

It is natural here to take ſome notice of *our own* cuſtoms concerning the inſtitution of Matrimony.

We ſeem to go on this principle, that a ſociety formed in order to bring up youth in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, ought to be formed with ſome ſolemnities of a religious ſort. And whatever inſpires religious ſentiments, will refine the ſexual appetites, and hinder them from degenerating into groſs brutality: will tend to meliorate love by a mixture with friendſhip; and ſenſual deſire, by eſteem of moral perfections.

It is of courſe that we reject unlimited intercourſe of the ſexes; but moreover, we reject *concubinage*; not only in the modern ſenſe of the word, but that kind of unequal marriage between maſter and ſlave, or ſervant, which uſed to be called concubinage in very ancient times. We place the huſband and wife in *one rank*, and make their reciprocal claims on each other's perſon and

property to be equal—We reject alſo *Polygamy* entirely.

We adopt the prohibitions and impediments, in reſpect of conſanguinity, &c. which are mentioned in the Moſaic law: but, it may be, they are ſuch as would reſult from the *moral* principles of Inceſt, applied to the prevailing cuſtoms of the part of the world which we inhabit[n].

We look upon Adultery[o] as diſſolving the marriage contract, and therefore, on proof of it, allow of *divorce*; but we take all methods to encourage honouring the wife as the weaker veſſel; and we inculcate not only gentleneſs and courteſy, but patience: of which our *Homily* is a reſpectable proof: the compoſition of ſome one who well knew, not only ſcripture, but human life.

In our Service, the Union between Chriſt and his Church, is ſet in the right light; and becomes, inſtead of a fooliſh argument for a *Sacrament*, a rational and affecting inducement, both to Chriſtian piety, and conjugal love.

One objection to this account, with reſpect to the equality of huſband and wife, is ſtriking; the wife contracts to *obey*; which the huſband does not. And it is true, that no *ſociety* can be carried on without *authority* lodged ſomewhere; but ſuch authority

[n] See Wheatly, page 425. Lev. xviii.—The table was drawn up by Archbiſhop *Parker*; who infers from one ſex to the other. The Romaniſts had too many impediments from conſanguinity, &c. we wanted to leſſen their number; what way more unexceptionable, or leſs likely to be excepted to, than for us to take the *Levitical* impediments? Extending them to both ſexes made them ſeem more numerous; and therefore nearer to the Popiſh; but the Jews muſt have extended them in like manner, by parity of reaſoning.

[o] This does not mean the Law of England, as it ſtands; that allows *no* divorce, (ſee Blackſtone, Index, Divorce); we mean thoſe principles on which a new Law may at any time be made; and on which new Statutes are framed occaſionally.

authority as is lodged with the huſband, is only for the ſake of *unity*; in order that education, &c. may not abſolutely ſtop: conjugal authority would be *abuſed*, according to our principles of marriage, if it gave any honour, privileges, accommodations, to the huſband, above the wife: the wife of a *Duke* is a *Ducheſs*, of a Peer a *Peereſs*, and ſo on; though in ancient times ſome ſorts of wives were little better than ſlaves; having little or no claim on the perſon or property of the huſband.

It may be ſaid, why could not conjugal authorty be *divided*, and given to the huſband in ſome things, to the wife in others? It ſeems probable, that if that had been done, the wife would not have had an influence ſo great, or ſo ſuited to her powers, as ſhe now has: the conjugal ſociety is formed ſo much upon ſentiment, that the exerciſe of its authority may be left more indeterminate than that of other ſocieties. The Magiſtrate ought indeed to have a power of protecting a wife from perſonal danger, or from what, in her rank, would be called indigence; but to make general laws that the wife in all families (and only general laws could be made) ſhould have ſo much conjugal authority, and no more, might be probably, in effect, preventing the huſband and wife from governing tacitly according to their reſpective powers of governing to good purpoſe.

The *American* Liturgy omits our expreſſion, "*with my Body I thee worſhip*;" the omiſſion makes the form appear to me very blank: *worſhip* is an old word for honour[p] or reſpect; and by the formulary uſed in our Liturgy upon putting on the ring, the huſband engages to treat his wife as an *equal*; in

[p] Art. XXII. Sect. IX.

in *perſon* and *property*; that is, not as a *concubine*, ſuch as *Hagar* was to Abraham. Now to change a form which does this, ſo as to make it only engage for reſpectful and honourable treatment in regard to *property*, is ſurely to cut off a material part; eſpecially if we conſider what St. Paul ſays, 1 Cor. vii. 4. I do not ſay that American huſbands do not treat their wives with perſonal reſpect; I ſpeak only of the propriety of a verbal *Form*. Yet I think the Engliſh Liturgy was formed by a wiſdom ſuperior to that which dictated the American.

The *Preſbyterians* ſeem only to *ſimplify* the rite of Marriage; whether with good effect, I ſhould much doubt. The account of the marriage-ceremony ordained in the *Directory*, as given in the preface to Grey's Hudibras, might not be too long for me to read to you.

VII. We come, laſtly, to the Hiſtory of the Romiſh ſacrament of *Extreme Unction*.

The primitive anointing of the ſick has been generally accounted the gift of *healing*; though Papiſts muſt maintain alſo a ſacramental unction. —In the ſeventh Century, we are told, Chriſtians practiſed unction with a view of curing their bodily diſeaſes. This was not merely a medicinal application of oil; it was religious, or rather ſuperſtitous: ſuperſtitious people, in different ages and countries, have run into a kind of religious[q] quackery.—But in the twelfth Century the bodily cures failed ſo often, that it was thought beſt to hold the anointing to be beneficial to the *Soul*, rather than the Body; and to the Body, only when bodily health would do the *ſoul no harm*.—When this

[q] See injunctions of King Edward VI. in Sparrow's Collection, page 9.—Fulke on the Rhemiſts, fol. 433, mentions a cuſtom of carrying home water, after it had been uſed for baptizing, in order to apply it to bodily ſores.

this came to be the notion, thoſe parts of the body were anointed which are conſidered as inſtruments of *ſin*[r].

Cave gives[s] us an account of an Office or ritual uſed in the Greek Church, and called Ευχελαιον, or prayers for the ceremony of extreme unction; it is part of the *Euchologion*, and is titled more fully, The Service of the Holy Oil, to be ſung by *ſeven* Prieſts, collected in the *Church* or *Houſe:* that is, the ſick man was to be brought to *Church* to be anointed if he was ſtrong enough to bear it; but if he was very weak indeed, "graviter afflictus et *proſtratus*," the *ſeven* Prieſts were then to ſing this ſervice at his houſe: many myſtical reaſons are given why the number ſhould be ſeven; and therefore we may ſuppoſe that it was never leſs.—Extreme unction, though practiſed in the Greek Church, is not there reckoned a *Sacrament:* nor was it of old, by Chryſoſtom; or indeed in the Latin Church by the venerable[t] Bede.

In the fourteenth Seſſion of the Council of Trent, we find three chapters and four Canons upon extreme unction. It is called, in the chapters, a proper *Sacrament*, intimated (*inſinuatum*[u]) by Chriſt in St. Mark's Goſpel, and recommended and publiſhed by St. James. From a *tradition* concerning the paſſage of St. James, Chap. v. 14, &c. the Church has learnt what that Apoſtle teaches; namely, that the *matter* of this Sacrament is *Oil*, the *Form*, theſe words, "*Per iſtam unctionem*, &c.—the *effect*, to *wipe off ſins*, and to promote

[r] This from Wheatly, page 475, &c.

[s] Hiſt. Lit. Diſſ. page 28.

[t] See Fulke againſt the Rhemiſts on James v.

[u] This word *inſinuatum* was a *correction* in the council:—a thing *might* be intimated in one place, and inſtituted in another; but, in that caſe, the Inſtitution would be the thing mentioned.

promote the health of the *Body*, when that is expedient for the *Soul*.—The *Elders* mentioned by St. James, mean *Prieſts*. This Sacrament is to be adminiſtered to perſons who ſeem to be "*in exitu vitæ*;"—from which it is ſometimes called "*Sacramentum exeuntium*."—The *Canons* are not content with ſaying, that this Sacrament was "*inſinuatum*" a Chriſto; they ſay it was a Chriſto Domino "noſtro *inſtitutum*." In other things they only repeat what was ſaid in the Chapters, annexing Anathemas.

The Trent Catechiſm tells us moreover at length what is the *Form* of this Sacrament; "God indulge" (or pardon) "thee by this holy unction, whatever offence thou haſt done through the fault of thy *eyes*, or *noſtrils*, or *touch*:"—And ſays, that the Inſtitution "*came* from Chriſt," and afterwards was *publiſhed* by St. James: it was *rather* to heal the *Soul* than the Body. This Sacrament is to be adminiſtered to ſuch as are "*grievouſly* ſick," but before they loſe their ſenſes.—Beſides the parts of the Body mentioned in the Form, ſome others are to be anointed: the *ears*, the *mouth*, the *hand*, the *feet*, and laſtly the *reins*, (only in men, not in[x] *women*,) "being the ſeat, as it were, of pleaſure and luſt."—And the ſacraments of Penance and the Euchariſt, are to be received as a *preparation* for that extreme unction.—This Sacrament is ſaid to require great *Truſt*, and to be ſometimes leſs effectual than it might be, through want of *Faith* in him who receives it.

The *Neceſſary Doctrine* ſays, that extreme unction (which it calls a *Sacrament*) is to be miniſtered to ſuch

[x] I do not ſee this diſtinction in the Catechiſm, but it is mentioned in *Limborch*. 5. 77. 21. where the account of the Romiſh notions is conciſe, and ſeems accurate.

ſuch as *require* it; that it is called extreme, or *laſt*, becauſe it comes after *other unctions:* it may be adminiſtered more than *once*, and ought to be, "in the *entrie* of ſickneſs;" and the Euchariſt ought to be received *after* it.

King Edward VI. retained[y] the cuſtom of anointing for ſome time, as a *temporary* indulgence to the *prejudices* of thoſe, who had been brought up in Popery: but in his *ſecond*[z] Liturgy it was omitted. Wheatly gives us the form, out of King Edward's firſt Liturgy, in which the Prieſt addreſſed the ſick perſon, when he anointed him, "upon the *forehead* and *breaſt* only." He alſo obſerves, that this unction might be conſidered as the remains, not of the primitive, but partly of the ancient, and partly of the Popiſh unction.

In our Liturgy, as it has ſtood ever ſince the publication of the ſecond Book of Edward VI. we have no unction; but we have a Viſitation of the Sick. Of this I may be expected to ſay ſomething; but my obſervations have been anticipated, either under the ſubject of *Confeſſion*, or under that of *Abſolution*. I ſeem now only to have to read to you the ſixty-ſeventh Canon, which leaves the whole *method* of inſtructing and comforting the ſick to the *diſcretion* of the Miniſter, if he be a *licenced preacher:* if he be not one, he is then "*to inſtruct and comfort*" the ſick "in their diſtreſs, according to the order of the *Communion-book*[a]."

P. S. In

[y] Mentioned Sect. 11.

[z] See Neal, page 37, Vol. 1. 4to. and Wheatly on Common Prayer, page 471. 477.

[a] See the Canons of 1603; and Wheatly, Introd. to Viſit. Sick.—He ſays, it may be *queſtioned* whether "by the Act for *Uniformity* of publick prayers, we be not reſtrained from *private Forms*."

P. S. In Wall's Infant Baptiſm it is ſaid[b], that the Engliſh *Baptiſts* uſe extreme unction, though rarely, and in hopes of recovery.

VIII. At length we have finiſhed the *Hiſtory* of this twenty-fifth Article, and we come now, in courſe, to the *Explanation.*

Our preſent Article has that for the firſt paragraph which was the laſt in the Article of 1552; and has that for the laſt, which was the firſt, after a ſentence[c] from an Epiſtle of Auguſtin to Januarius: in the middle it has a rejection of five popiſh ſacraments, which in King Edward's Article were not mentioned.—It has omitted one ſentence of the former Article, concerning the effect of the Sacraments being "*ex opere operato*"—in the Engliſh, "*of the work wrought:*" retaining the *ſenſe*, in the reſt, but dropping the *phraſe*, with the remark upon it.

The firſt paragraph of our Article contains a *definition* of a Sacrament; which it is no very eaſy matter to give: we have one in our ſhort Catechiſm; to thoſe who find one of theſe intelligible, the other will be ſo too.—It ſeems to me a good way to get at the meaning of our Church, to conſider what opinions ſhe wiſhes to *avoid.*—With regard to the nature of a ſacrament, ſhe wiſhes firſt to avoid the notion, that it is a mere *badge*, by which Chriſtians are diſtinguiſhed from Heathens; and next the notion, that it acts *mechanically* upon the Soul, as a powerful *medicine* does upon the Body. If the inquirer finds any ſpace between theſe two notions, the Church of England ſeems willing that he ſhould range in it freely. We muſt ſuppoſe ſome outward *ſign*, and ſome inward meaning; this meaning muſt imply ſome

[b] Part 2. Chap. viii. Sect. 11. page 446, quarto.
[c] Sect. 11.

ſome *good* affecting our *minds*, and the *future* happineſs of our Souls; and *appropriated* to ourſelves by our own voluntary acts; and then other particulars, if any there be, may be left unaſcertained. —My own idea of a Sacrament is, a ceremony, which expreſſes by *viſible words* (as Auguſtin[d] calls them) ſome great *Benefit* beſtowed by God on Man; which may be ſome beneficial *ſtate* or condition, leading to great good: a ceremony immediately injoined by divine authority:—It is called an outward "ſign of an inward and *ſpiritual grace*," or *favour*; but *inward*, is only oppoſed to *outward*; and means, the *benefit* ſhadowed out by the ceremony: and any benefit (or grace, or favour) may be called *ſpiritual*, which relates to the future happineſs of our Soul or Spirit, or to the improvement of the *mind: ſpiritual* is oppoſed to the *material* ſign; and its ſenſe beſt got by taking it ſo.—If it appears to any Chriſtian, that God's Holy Spirit muſt be concerned in a ſacrament, he may ſatisfy himſelf thus. When we come to conſider attentively how great and wonderful a thing it is, that *God* ſhould inſtitute a ceremony for *us*: and how grateful we ought to be for the benefit which it ſhadows out, and how diligent we ought to be in ſecuring and rightly applying that benefit, we muſt feel very great moral *improvement*[e]: and all ſuch improvement it is our duty to *refer* to the aſſiſtance of the Holy *Spirit*. The nature and manner of ſuch reference belongs to the tenth Article.—This moral improvement, this diſpelling of our weakneſſes, this warming of our ſentiments, and confirming of our good principles, is called, with reſpect to the Lord's Supper, "the *ſtrengthening* and *refreſhing* of

[d] Contra Fauſtum, 19. 16. cited by Forbes, 9. 1. 32.

[e] P. S. I think our Reformers had much the ſame idea: See Reform. Legum, de Hæreſibus, cap. 17.

of our ſouls."—I ſhould think, that this might ſerve as an Explanation of the firſt paragraph: to me it makes that paragraph intelligible.

The ſecond paragraph needs no explanation.

In the third ſome expreſſions may be noticed.

"Thoſe five *commonly* called ſacraments"—we ſhould not expreſs ourſelves ſo *now*, but the *five* were very commonly called ſacraments when the Articles were made.—"Sacraments of the *Goſpel*;"—this is oppoſed to *Sacramenta* in the *large* ſenſe, as meaning any *emblematical* actions of a ſacred nature.

In the remaining part of the Article we have ſeveral inſtances of the *plural* number being uſed when only *one* ſingle thing is meant.—The *Puritans*[f] objected to this, at the Hampton Court Conference; making confirmation to be included in both expreſſions "corrupt following"—and, "allowed"—at leaſt that is the beſt ſenſe that I can make of the objection. Corrupt imitation[g] of the Apoſtles, may relate to confirmation, orders, and extreme unction, or it may mean only the laſt; but "*ſtates* of Life allowed in the Scriptures," ſeems to mean Matrimony alone: our *Homily*[h] ſays, "*godly ſtates* of life," meaning the ſame thing. —Afterwards, "Sacraments" are not "to be *gazed upon*," &c. is applicable to the Lord's ſupper only: "duly *uſe them*," may indeed include Baptiſm, becauſe conſecrated water uſed to be carried home and given to the *diſeaſed*[i]. But St. Paul's[k] paſſage about

[f] See Neal, Vol. 1, quarto, page 415.

[g] Art. IX. "*following* of Adam." Sect. XVII.

[h] Page 277, octavo.

[i] Fulke on Rhemiſts, fol. 433, top: As in Sect. VII.

[k] 1 Cor. xi. 29.—Yet Auguſtin treats of the efficacy of Baptiſm as depending on the worthineſs of the receiver.—Forbes, 10. 1. 20.—10. 2. 14.

about unworthy receiving, relates to no Sacrament but the Lord's Supper.

In excuſe for this uſing plural where only one thing is meant[1], we may ſay, let any one try to uſe the ſingular number, and yet keep to the ſubject of Sacraments in general. Several other little things may be ſaid. – "*They*" is ſometimes uſed, when the meaning only is, to keep the expreſſion general, and not determine whether *He* or *She* or *ſeveral*, be meant. 'They whom I ſhall employ in this buſineſs, will do it well, You may depend upon it:' a perſon who ſaid this might employ *one* man, or one *woman*; as well as ſeveral.—We affirm concerning anything in the plural when we are ſpeaking of it as being ſome *ſpecies*, or *claſs*. —Your *Voltaires* are dangerous people.—*Forbes*[m] ſays, "Patres aliquando, de uno Sacramento loquentes, utuntur vocabulo numeri pluralis." – And in the Epiſtle to the Hebrews we find ſomething which ſeems to be of the ſame nature[n]; "ſubdued kingdoms," &c. &c. predicated of a few particular men; Gedeon, Barach, &c. every *one* of whom did not perform *all* the exploits there mentioned; though they were performed by the perſons named.

We cannot well ſay more in the way of Explanation without incroaching on ſome of the ſubſequent Articles.

IX. Our *Proof* muſt be directed ſolely againſt the *five* Popiſh ſacraments which we reject; all the reſt belongs to other places.—In diſputing whether different things can be called by the ſame name, we are apt to run into trifling propoſitions, by uſing that name in different ſenſes; but here we ſeem

[1] Archbiſhop Uſher keeps this mode of expreſſion in his Iriſh Articles.

[m] Forbes, 9. 5. 6.

[n] Heb. xi. 33.

ſeem ſecure from that ſnare; for the Romiſh Church defines a Sacrament much as ours does; and without that, it would be enough if we proved, that the Romiſh five, are not ſacraments in the ſame ſenſe with Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper.

In the Trent[o] Catechiſm a ſacrament is defined, "a thing ſubject to *ſenſe* which, by *God's* appointment, has vertue both to *ſignifie* and to *work* holineſs and righteouſneſs."—"*God's* appointment" cannot ſignify the courſe of *nature* or *providence*, for all Sacraments are held by the Romaniſts[p] to be appointed by *Chriſt*. In this definition there are *four* parts correſponding to the four parts of ours.—1. An external part.—2. An appointment of Chriſt.—3. A ſignifying, or ſign, or pledge.—4. An inviſible efficacy.—This ſettled, we may briefly remark on the Romiſh *five*.

Confirmation ſeems ſufficiently authorized as an holy ceremony, but it has no external rite appointed by Chriſt. Impoſition of hands is not peculiar to it, and Chriſm is of human invention.

Penance, or penitence, public or private, is an important thing; but it has no tolerable pretenſions to inſtitution of Chriſt as a viſible ceremony. The confeſſion mentioned James v. 16. is, in ſome way, *mutual*. And the *effects* of Popiſh penance may be expected to prove ſuch as are deſcribed, Ezek. xiii. 10.

Ordination, or *Orders*, is very well authorized; but *Chriſt* never ordained with any viſible ſign, nor ever inſtituted any for his Apoſtles: they uſed impoſition of hands, but not for ordaining only.

Matrimony was not inſtituted by Chriſt, in any ſenſe; he *confirmed* it as a contract, but not even as a *ſacred* contract: nor did he appoint any *rite* for

[o] Page 131, or Sect. x. of Sacraments in general.
[p] Trent Seſſ. vii. Canon 1.

for the execution of the contract. And it is one in which the Supreme Being is no *Party*. As to Eph. v. 32. — the marriage of Chriſt and his Church is certainly a *myſtery*, μυςηριου, which in Latin is rendered *ſacramentum*; but the meaning only is, that Chriſt is not *literally* married to his Church, but only *metaphorically*, or myſtically.— This is only an argument in one language; tranſlate it, and it vaniſhes into nothing.

Extreme unction, if enjoined at all, was enjoined not by Chriſt, but after his Death.—Mark vi. 13. relates cures merely of a bodily ſort; and even in bodily cures oil was not always uſed by Chriſt.— James v. 14, &c. ſeems to me to mean nothing beyond the compaſs of ordinary practical piety and benevolence; as I will endeavour to ſhew more at large.

Our *Homily*[q] on Common Prayer and Sacraments ſhews theſe *five* to be no Sacraments in about one page.

How different are they from thoſe two which we retain! inſtituted for the moſt important ſituations; for a change of life on *entrance* into the Chriſtian covenant; for a proſpect of *eternal* happineſs, to be attained by the Chriſtian ſacrifice: confined to no rank or order of Chriſtians; inſtituted, both as to their external rites and their influence on the heart, with a plainneſs wholly incontrovertible[r]!

x. As the Romiſh Sacrament of Extreme Unction is founded on one ſingle paſſage of Scripture, James v. 14, 15. I think our end will be beſt anſwered if I give you my idea of that paſſage. I found

[q] Page 276, 277, octavo.

[r] St. Paul ſeems to me to make quite a ſeparate claſs of Ordinances, of our two Sacraments, in 1 Cor. xii. 13.—See *Locke's* Paraphraſe.—The Rhemiſts take no notice of it.

I found I had not a ſatisfactory notion of it, and therefore I ſet myſelf to conſider it without conſulting commentators. It appeared to me to have the following meaning.—'I am giving you (St. *James* is ſuppoſed to ſpeak, or write) miſcellaneous moral and religious directions, as is uſual at the cloſe of an Epiſtle; let me direct what is to be done in caſes of *ſickneſs:* Is any one indiſpoſed amongſt you? he will of courſe take all *human*[s] means of recovery: *that* need not be adviſed; but let him not neglect *religion:* ſickneſs is favourable to piety, and ſhould always be conſidered, though with due modeſty and diffidence, as the *viſitation* of God. And it is He who muſt give a *bleſſing* to the beſt judged *medicine*, before it can be effectual. (Pſalm cxxvii.) Let then the ſick man act as is moſt likely to promote piety in himſelf, and to draw down the bleſſing of Almighty God upon his endeavours.—Man was not made to be *alone*; as little in ſickneſs, and as little in Religion, as in any thing elſe: let the ſick man then invite ſome grave elderly Chriſtians, amongſt whom will naturally be ſome of ſacred characters; and let them form a little *domeſtic religious ſociety*. As a ſociety cannot proceed without ſome *ceremony*; let ſome one of theſe reſpectable perſons, as by commiſſion from them all, make ſome *application* of ſomething uſually eſteemed *mild and lenient*, to the *Body* of the indiſpoſed: this is to be done *religiouſly*, or "in the name of the Lord:" and the ceremony will diſpoſe the company properly for what is the *principal* thing, *domeſtic prayer*, and *Interceſſion*.—"O how amiable" muſt ſuch devotion be! how improving to the minds of all! how likely to draw down

[s] See in Sparrow's *Rationale*, page 300, a decree, that Phyſicians ſhall direct their patients to ſend for Divines. The ſame in Wheatly.

down the *bleſſing* of "the Lord!" *Surely* he will hear the prayers of his *faithful* ſervants; ſurely there is ground for *confidence*, that he will raiſe up the dejected!—and as our *Lord* joined *forgiveneſs* of ſins with bodily *healing*, the whole of one of his bleſſed cures will be accompliſhed!—Perhaps the indiſpoſed may be troubled in *mind*; O, let mutual confidence, in all ſuch caſes, open the *heart*, to ſo venerable a fraternity! that muſt needs give new ſtrength to interceſſion. Think not that I direct you thus without reaſon and example; I have juſt now mentioned the "patience of *Job*;" let me, in like manner, ſuggeſt to you the ſucceſsful Interceſſions of *Elijah*.'

As this interpretation is not the ſame with that given by Commentators, they generally taking St. James's unction either for a ſacrament, or for an exerciſe of the miraculous gift[t] of healing, it may be proper to offer ſome reaſons for my own opinion.

1. The word ἀσθενεῖ does not ſeem to denote any *grievous* or *dangerous*[u] ſickneſs; nothing which could give occaſion to the name of *extreme* unction, or require the help of a *miracle*: the ſick man is ſuppoſed well enough to *invite* the Elders.

2. It ſeemed to me, that *Elders* might mean *elderly Chriſtians*, whether in orders or not: the Apoſtles *ordain* Elders; but that does not ſeem to prove that elderly *Laymen*, or elderly men *as ſuch*, were *never* called πρεσβυτεροι.—In *Fulke's* anſwer to the Rhemiſts on James v. I ſince find, that *Bede*[x], rendered πρεσβυτεροι, "the elder ſort:" and I find other remarks in ſupport of the interpretation.—Dr. Powell ſays[y], that it is not known exactly,

[t] 1 Cor. xii. 9. 28. 30.
[u] Lex. Steph. quotes Cyrop. Lib. 8.
[x] A. D. 701; Lardner. [y] Page 364. Theſis.

exactly, what was the nature of the Preſbyters in the Apoſtolic age.

3. The uſe of *Oil* ſeems to prove nothing, as to any cure being *miraculous:* it is uſed Mark vi. 13. in miraculous cures; but it was only as the *clay* and *ſpittle* which Chriſt uſed in curing the blind. Sometimes impoſition of hands was uſed, and ſometimes all externals were omitted. Oil may be uſed in any emblematical ceremony, as well as impoſition of hands in Ordination; it was ſo uſed in early times of the Chriſtian Church, as we ſaw under Confirmation[z].

4. It is not the Oil, but the *Prayer* which is ſaid to *ſave* (σωζειν) him who *labours* under infirmity. (καμνοντα.)

5. The expreſſion "*ſhall* ſave the ſick," looks at firſt as if a *miraculous* cure was meant; but "*ſhall ſave*," cannot be taken literally; becauſe ſomething is ſpoken of which is to be done to *all* ſick Chriſtians, and if "*ſhall ſave*," was to be taken literally, or the cure was *miraculous*, none would *die*. —Why, in that caſe, ſhould the example of *Elias* be brought as an argument, or as a perſuaſive? Beſides, is prayer never unſucceſsful? the inſtance could only prove that prayer *may* ſave.

6. The *Lord's* raiſing up the ſick man, implies nothing miraculous; in the language of Piety, the Lord raiſes up *every one* who *recovers*.

7. As to *forgiveneſs* of ſin, it is in ſo many places joined with healing, ſome of which have nothing[a] miraculous in them, that I look upon it as

[z] Sect. 111.

[a] See Pſalm ciii. 3. with Biſhop Lowth's note on Iſaiah xxxiii. 24. and liii. 4.—See alſo Matt. ix. 5. (with proverb in Whitby's note) and its parallels, Mark ii. 9.—Luke v. 23.—Matt. viii. 17,—Hammond cites more texts, and mentions the caſe of Hezekiah.—In the Old Italic verſion ιαθητε is even *tranſlated* ut *remittatur* vobis. (Michaelis, Introd. Lect. quarto, Sect.

as a kind of Jewiſh phraſe to expreſs a *cure*.—Under the tenth and ſeventeenth Articles we mentioned, that the phraſeology of the Jews refers all ſorts of events to God.—And on a footing of natural religion we may ſay, that *all evil is puniſhment*; though God may in this life puniſh men *collectively*: *ſufferings* may fall upon *mankind* for the faults or negligence of *mankind*. Were it eaſily admitted that all evil is puniſhment, it muſt follow, that the removal of evil, is forgiveneſs.

8. In order to have the example of *Elias*, we muſt ſee that the fifteenth and ſixteenth verſes are on the ſame ſubject. This appears ſufficiently from the word ιαθῆτε: but in two[b] good MSS. the word αν ſhews alſo a connexion.—αλληλοις, and ὑπερ αλληλων, may mean, *in turns*; that is, when any one is ſick, let him open his mind, and let his pious friends intercede for him. If this was made a cuſtom, each Chriſtian, (in caſe of recovery) would be ſometimes the viſited, ſometimes the comforter and interceſſor. Firſt it is ſaid, if any one is ſick, the Elders ſhould, if invited, pray by him. The inference is more extenſive; 'open *then* your hearts to one *another*, when *by turns* you labour under ſickneſs; and pray *mutually* for ſick neighbours.'

All theſe remarks occur in reading the paſſage itſelf; others ariſe from ſome extraneous circumſtances.

1. There is no probability, that a cuſtom of miraculous healing, or a ſacrament of perpetual obligation, ſhould be inſtituted at the concluſion of

Sect. 62.) Our church, in the Office for the Viſitation of the Sick, ſpeaks of ſickneſs as certainly God's viſitation; and as what *may* be ſent to correct and amend what is offenſive to God.

[b] Firſt New Coll. and firſt Steph.

of an Epiſtle, in the midſt of moral directions, with every thing ordinary and natural, with nothing ſimilar before or after it. I ſhould imagine, there might not be found an inſtance of anything but moral directions at the cloſe of an Epiſtle. Nor can we conceive, that anything ſupernatural could be inſtituted in ſo *few words*, without any mention having been made of it *by Chriſt*; or by St. *Paul* when treating of miraculous gifts. Had *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper* been founded on only one text each, I ſhould think they reſted on weak foundations.

2. Thoſe who have attended to the conduct of St. *James*, will not think it like his uſual *prudence* to inſtitute ſupernatural obſervances in the ſlight and ſudden manner here ſuppoſed.—I refer chiefly to what is called the Council[c] of Jeruſalem.—Acts xv. 13.

3. The *ceremony* ſuppoſed in my interpretation, does not ſeem an *unlikely* one to take place, nor contrary to the cuſtoms of early Chriſtians. Their throwing *aſhes* on the head of a Chriſtian on Aſh-Wedneſday, was of a ſimilar nature[d].

4. We muſt not be underſtood to ſay, that no Elder, when St. James wrote, had that *Gift of healing*, which is repeatedly mentioned by St. Paul. In the caſe before us, whatever might be the efficacy of the religious act, it ſhould be aſcribed to *prayer*.

5. Without determining the nature of St. James's injunction, we might inquire, how far it admitted of *change* in after times.—It ſeems as if the *Oil*, on any ſuppoſition, muſt be changeable; for miraculous cures were not always performed with Oil; and in mere ceremonies, oil was accidental,

[c] Art. xxi. Sect. 1.—See alſo Art. vi. Sect. xxiv.
[d] Biſhop Bramhall, cited by Puller, page 275.

accidental, depending upon local cuſtoms or the produce of the earth. Oil ſeems to have been an eſtabliſhed[e], mild remedy in ſurgery; as appears from the application of it by the good *Samaritan*; and therefore any other eſtabliſhed mild remedy might be[f] ſubſtituted for it. Nor does the opinion, that St. James's unction was miraculous, make much difference; ſince a natural practice of an ordinary ſort, has been ſhewn, in ſeveral inſtances[g], to follow a ſimilar extraordinary ſupernatural one, without interruption.

XI. Such is our direct proof; if we aimed at any indirect, we might anſwer the weak *objection* of *Anthony Randall*, that *Sacrament* is not a[h] *ſcriptural term:* it is in the Latin, and in the Latin only; it could not be in the original.—But it is not neceſſary that when Scripture inſtitutes a *thing*, it ſhould alſo give it an authentic *name*; and yet when Chriſtians have occaſion to ſpeak frequently of that thing, they muſt give it *ſome name*, as they do to other things: and they are moſt ſtrongly induced to do ſo when there are ſeveral obſervances which want a *common* name.

The word μυστηριον is more confined in its meaning than *Sacramentum*. Every emblematical action has an outward meaning and an inward one: Sacramentum includes both; but μυστηριον expreſſes only the inward meaning.—Hence Sacramentum is not a good tranſlation of μυστηριον; more eſpecially as μυστηριον never[i], in Scripture, is uſed about external

[e] What ſay *Hippocrates* and *Galen*, of Oil?

[f] The Oil would be called a *Tradition*, in Art. XXXIV.

[g] In Ordination, Art. XXIII. Sect. XXV. in Confirmation, Sect. III. of this Article.

[h] The Quakers think this argument worth adopting: ſee Barclay's Apology, Prop. 12. ſect. 2. beginning.

[i] Limborch, 5. 66. 10. For myſteries in the *Church*, ſee Bingham, Index, mentioned beginning of Sect. II. of this Article.

external rites. The *Church* got to call ſeveral things myſteries.

XII. In the way of *Application* much need not be ſaid.

If Dr. *Dupin* would not give up the five as Sacraments, would he (or his ſucceſſors) agree to make two *claſſes* of Sacraments; and let us uſe *Sacramentum* for any ſacred emblematical act, as the ancient Fathers did, without determining whether it was of *divine* or *human* appointment? — the Romaniſts themſelves make a difference between their Sacraments in point of rank.—Still extreme unction would remain unſettled. Might we adopt ſome ceremony, in the viſitation of the ſick, *analogous* to that mentioned by St. James, according to the idea of it here given[k]?

For my own part, I know not whether ſuch an alteration would not ſeem to me an *Improvement*. A fomentation, or ſomething of that ſort, might be ſubſtituted for unction: ſome taſks, penances, exerciſes, might be impoſed in caſe of recovery, after the manner of the ancient clinic[l] abſolution; any good reſolutions recorded in the preſence of reſpectable witneſſes[m], would be the more likely to be kept on that account. Surely a meeting of pious, diſcreet, elderly neighbours, ſome clergy amongſt them, forming a domeſtic religious aſſembly, praying together, under due regulation, in the houſe of a ſick man, if it became generally cuſtomary, and was held at different houſes interchangeably, might be the means of promoting mutual benevolence;

[k] Sect. x. beginning and end.

[l] Wheatly, page 468.

[m] Wheatly ſeems to favour the idea of *Witneſſes*, page 468.

volence; and might in time produce a great *increaſe* of *Piety* and *Virtue*[n].

[n] For the reaſons mentioned in former inſtances, I again mention, that thoſe who took notes during the Lectures, will not find every thing in their notes, which they find here. Want of time obliged me to omit the tenth Section entirely, and the greateſt part of the eleventh.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXVI.

OF THE UNWORTHINESS OF THE MINISTERS, WHICH HINDERS NOT THE EFFECT OF THE SACRAMENTS.

ALTHOUGH in the viſible Church the evil be ever mingled with the good, and ſometimes the evil have chief authority in the Miniſtration of the Word and Sacraments; yet foraſmuch as they do not the ſame in their own Name, but in Chriſt's, and do miniſter by his commiſſion and authority, we may uſe their Miniſtry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments. Neither is the effect of Chriſt's ordinance taken away by their wickedneſs, nor the grace of God's gifts diminiſhed from ſuch, as by faith, and rightly do receive the Sacraments miniſtered unto them; which be effectual, becauſe of Chriſt's inſtitution and promiſe, although they be miniſtered by evil men.

Nevertheleſs, it appertaineth to the diſcipline of the Church, that enquiry be made of evil Miniſters, and that they be accuſed by thoſe that have knowledge of their offences; and finally, being found guilty, by juſt judgment be depoſed.

---

1. The *Hiſtory* of this Article ſeems to lie chiefly in the age of the Reformation; when thoſe who were heightening every evil of Popery, and painting

painting it, to themſelves and others, in the darkeſt colours, amongſt other things, ſuggeſted and maintaintained, that ſuch wicked miniſters as the Popiſh Prieſts were, muſt ſhock every ſerious man by their preaching, inſtead of amending his heart; and muſt vitiate even the Sacraments themſelves. —Our Church ſhewed its moderation and good ſenſe in not running the lengths of ſuch reformers, being ſoon aware of the difficulties to which their notion muſt lead.—But before we refer to any authorities, let us look to *early* times, and ſee whether anything ſimilar appears.

The *idea* that ſacraments adminiſtered by Prieſts of immoral character, debauched, drunken, "lovers of pleaſure more[a] than lovers of God," ſhould be ſomething different from what they ought to be, and were intended to be, ſeems not unnatural.— A ſacrament muſt appear to the mind, an holy ordinance, adminiſtered to devout Chriſtians, by a ſacred officer ſtill more devout: whatever deranged this conception muſt ſeem, at firſt, to deſtroy the vital ſpirit of the whole ordinance.— And though *reaſon* might ſuggeſt what is urged in our Article, yet the *feelings* and prejudices would ſcarce ever be reconciled to a Sacrament given by a bad man: nay difficulties would ariſe on all ſides, and would continue to haraſs the mind. Is this, (a communicant would always aſk himſelf) the repreſentative of God? of Chriſt? or even of the Church? No; they muſt all diſclaim him! can the wicked be attended to by Him who is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity? by him who knew no ſin? or can any man be conſidered as bearing the commiſſion of that Religious Society, whoſe ſanctity he profanes? Such arguing, I ſay, is not unnatural: it has, in truth, occaſioned the difficulties

[a] 2 Tim. iii. 4.

difficulties which have made it worth while to compoſe an Article on our preſent ſubject.—But our immediate buſineſs is with the Hiſtory of early times.

Cyprian, who is placed in 248, Bp. of Carthage, a man of an excellent character, fell into diſputes with other Chriſtian leaders, about *re-baptizing* thoſe, who had been baptized in any *Sect*, out of the main body of Chriſtians, or according to the language of the times, out of the communion of the *Catholic* Church. Theſe diſputes muſt be about the effect of Sacraments being hindered by ſome imperfection or *unworthineſs* in thoſe who adminiſtered them; for there ſeems nothing peculiar to Baptiſm in the queſtion. Cyprian was of opinion, that the ſacraments, in this caſe, were *ineffectual*; or, in other words, he was for the re-baptizing of thoſe, who had been baptized by *Heretics*. His chief opponent was Stephen Biſhop of Rome, whoſe opinion, in all its particulars, is not exactly[b] known.

The *Donatiſts* are placed by Lardner in 312. Their ſeparation from the Church was owing to no difference about doctrine, but at firſt to a conteſt about the appointment of a Biſhop of Carthage. This appointment was made by ſome *Africans* (the inhabitants[c] of Africa Proconſularis) without conſulting the churches of Numidia: theſe latter, thinking themſelves ill uſed, made all poſſible exceptions to the appointment, and then diſputes aroſe about the reaſonableneſs of ſuch exceptions. The Numidians, amongſt whom were one or two leading

[b] Lard. Cred. *Cyprian*: or Works, Vol. 3, page 137.

[c] In Africa there were ſix Roman Provinces; one of which was *Africa Proconſularis*, another *Numidia*: Bingham, Ant. 9. 2. 5.— *Carthage* was the Metropolis of Africa Proconſularis.

leading men of the name of *Donatus*, excepted particularly to the new Biſhop (whoſe name was Cæcilianus) as a man of immoral character, in ſome reſpects; and they excepted to his conſecration, as having been performed by a Traitor, or *Traditor*, that is, one who had through fear delivered up the ſcriptures, in the times of perſecution, to thoſe who meant to deſtroy them. A church governed by ſuch perſons, they ſaid, could be no true church; all its ordinances, even the ſacraments themſelves, muſt loſe their proper effect under ſuch adminiſtration. Nay, when heated with diſpute, they went ſo far as to re-baptize thoſe Africans, who came over to their party, if not Europeans who had communicated with them; which was profeſſing, in the moſt open manner, the invalidity of the ſacramental forms when uſed by their adverſaries. The Donatiſts were very numerous, ſo as to be governed by 400 Biſhops. (Moſheim.)

They had alſo a very formidable force amongſt them; a large band of Fanatics, called *Circumcelliones*, who uſed *violence*, and were guilty of extenſive and numerous *maſſacres:* theſe were alſo ſo wild as to fancy, that they ſuffered *martyrdom* if they deſtroyed themſelves, or compelled others to deſtroy them.

The writings of Auguſtin and Optatus ſeem to have had great effect on the Donatiſts; which ſhews, that they had ſome good principles.

This affair of the Donatiſts being ſimilar to that in which Cyprian was engaged, and both happening in Africa (in the larger ſenſe) the latter renewed the idea of the former; and the writers in the controverſy with the Donatiſts, become expoſitors of Cyprian and Stephen.—The chief writers on the ſide of the Donatiſts were Parmenianus, Petilianus,

Petilianus, Creſconius, &c. Their adverſaries were Auguſtin and Optatus, whoſe writings muſt be ſtudied by any one that wiſhes to be fully informed on the ſubject. He would find them rational and ſpirited, and agreeing with our[d] church.

Now it does not appear to me, that theſe two celebrated caſes are exactly parallel to ours; becauſe in both, the Miniſters are ſuppoſed diſqualified *ab initio*, whereas our Miniſters, in the preſent Article, are ſuppoſed to be regularly ordained.—But yet theſe caſes would produce arguments which would affect the ſubject now before us; eſpecially as Cæcilianus was accuſed of immoralities, though perhaps unjuſtly. It would thence come to be argued generally, whether *vice*, in a miniſter, hinders the effect of his miniſterial acts.

11. But not to detain you longer from the age of the *Reformation*. I have not the works of Wickliffe at hand, but I ſuſpect, that, inveighing againſt the wickedneſs of the Romiſh Prieſts, he uſed, as one topic, the notion, that their profligacy muſt vitiate the Sacraments; or he ſaid ſomething which his enemies might repreſent as meaning that. The council of Conſtance made decrees againſt him, and determined to dig up his bones on account of certain propoſitions:—One of them was, "If a Biſhop or Prieſt live in mortal ſin, he[e] ordaineth not, baptizeth not, conſecrateth not."—Another propoſition ſaid to be taken out of Wickliffe, as to the *ſum*[f], is, "The ill Life of a Prelate

[d] Take a ſpecimen in Forbes, 10. 1. 8. from Aug. de Unico Baptiſmo contra Petilianum.

[e] Theſe are the words in Baxter's Hiſt. of Councils, page 431.—Thoſe in page 438, are there ſaid to be "*charged* on John *Huſs*," but in page 439, "taken out of Wickliffe."

[f] Page 438; ſee alſo page 439.

a Prelate ſubtracteth the ſubjects acceptation of orders, and other ſacraments;"—"and yet in caſe of neceſſity," &c. But the Council of Conſtance might miſrepreſent the ſayings of the Reformers.

In the *Neceſſary Doctrine*, &c. we have a paſſage to our purpoſe, on the ſubject of the Romiſh Sacrament of *Orders*[g], in which mention is made of the Donatiſts, and the opinions of ſome ancients introduced, as Chryſoſtom, Ambroſe, and Gregory of Nazianzum. This work agrees with the doctrine of our Church.

The Anabaptiſts, at the time of the Reformation, ran into this error, that the vices of Miniſters muſt annull the force of Sacraments; as might be expected from their unthinking ſeverity and moroſeneſs. Luther ſays of them[h], (Anabaptiſtæ) "propter hominum vitia vel *indignitatem* ("*unworthineſs*," the expreſſion of our Article) damnant verum Baptiſma." And *Forbes*[i], in his tenth Book and ſecond Chapter, ſpeaks of the old controverſy, "de fide et probitate baptizantis," being renewed by the Anabaptiſts at the Reformation; whoſe fundamental principle I judge (from *Moſheim's* account of them) to be, that the viſible church of Chriſt, muſt be *perfect* in *fact* as well as in *Theory*. In the *Reformatio Legum* (de Hæreſibus, Cap. 15.) the Anabaptiſts are charged with ſeceding from the Church, and *Sacraments*, ſaying, that they are kept away, "vel *miniſtrorum improbitate*, vel aliorum fratrum.

The Council of *Trent* anathematizes thoſe who ſay, that a Prieſt living in mortal ſin, cannot confer a Sacrament. The Catechiſm is expreſſed not unlike

[g] About three pages from the beginning of the ſubject.
[h] Works, Vol. 2, fol. 503.
[i] Forbes, 10. 2. 1. and 10. 4. 11.

unlike our own[k] Article.—Thoſe who follow the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, "damnant Donatiſtas et ſimiles, qui negabant licere populo uti miniſterio in Eccleſiâ, et ſentiebant miniſterium malorum inutile et inefficax[l] eſſe."—The *Helvetic* ſays[m], that the perfection of Sacraments does not depend on the worthineſs or unworthineſs of thoſe who give them. And the *Scotch*, that for the right *uſe* of Sacraments, it is requiſite that their end and deſign ſhould be rightly underſtood by Miniſter and people. The preſbyterians do not ſeem to condemn the error heartily.

Heylin, in his introduction to his Life of Archbiſhop Laud[n], ſays, that the Church of England joins with the Church of Rome in ſeveral points, in oppoſition to *Sectaries* of various kinds; amongſt other Articles, he mentions that "of hindering the effect of the Sacraments by unworthy Miniſters."—And *Du Pin*, in his commonitorium[o], makes no objection to our twenty-ſixth Article.

Barclay, in his Apology for the *Quakers*, treats the diſtinction uſed in our Article between the *Man* and the *Miniſter*, as frivolous; and ſeemingly runs into the notion lately mentioned as held by the firſt Anabaptiſts, that becauſe the Church of Chriſt is perfect in Theory, it muſt be ſo in *fact*: that

[k] See alſo Catech. on the *Euchariſt*: Sect. LXXIV. page 232. —Acts of the Council, Seſſion vii. Canon 12; on Sacraments in *general*.

[l] Syntagma, Aug. Conf. Art. viii. or page 13. of ſecond part.

[m] The Helvetic Churches were founded by *Zuinglius*; the *Dutch* have much of *Calvin's* notion in their doctrine: the French Proteſtants are called *Calviniſts* in France. (Voltaire, Louis XIV. *Calviniſme*).—Calvin, Inſt. 17. 16. agrees with us: See a paſſage in Bingham's Works, Vol. 2, page 565, from Archbiſhop Whitgift, expreſſing the opinion of Calvin.

[n] Page 37. [o] Append. to Moſheim.

that is, no imperfect church muſt be allowed to be a true Church. One ſees what the ſcope of the reaſoning is; to depreciate all ſacraments, by heightening the defects to which they may be liable in ſome particular caſes, in the preſent faulty ſtate of things; in order to draw men from externals, and bring them to truſt only to the internal *light*.—The idea was not new in Barclay's time. In the Helvetic Confeſſion are theſe words; Neque eos probamus, qui propter *inviſibilia*, aſpernantur in ſacramentis *viſibilia*, &c. quales *Meſſaliani*[p] fuiſſe dicuntur.

III. But though we may agree with the Church of Rome as to the perfection of ſacraments adminiſtered by imperfect men; yet there is another thing, very nearly allied to this, in which we oppoſe them: that is, the effect of the *Intention* of a Prieſt when he adminiſters Sacraments.

Intention is not the ſame with *Probity*; becauſe a man of a general good character, might not *intend* to give a ſacrament, as ſuch, on a particular occaſion, or he might be *abſent* in mind, &c.—and a bad man might intend it. But yet theſe are connected[q]: ordinarily, a good man will have the pureſt intention in all offices of religion. The Romaniſts mention worthineſs and intention together[r]. And they deſcribe their meaning by ſaying, that a Miniſter muſt intend, in order to have his acts effectual, what the *Church*[s] intends; the Church, I ſuppoſe, from which he receives his

[p] For Meſſaliani, or Euchitæ, ſee Art. XXV. Sect. 11. where there is mention of the Quakers, and of this paſſage: for ſome half converted Quakers, ſee the ſixth Section of this Article.

[q] Forbes, 10. 1. 18.

[r] See Council of Trent, Seſſ. 7. Can. 11, 12.—And Catechiſm, Part. 2. Sect. 23, of Sacraments in general.

[s] Council and Catechiſm, ibid.

his commiſſion: but the Romaniſts conceive only one true church.—This idea of what the Miniſter is to intend, was delivered by Pope Eugenius[t] in the Council of *Florence*, in the year 1438.—And, though the Council of Trent adopted it, yet Caterini[u] argued, in that Council, as a Proteſtant would now argue[x].

We muſt not, however, think that the queſtion about the intention of the Miniſter, was firſt ſtarted even in the Council of Florence. So long ago as the time of *Athanaſius*, it was diſcuſſed.—Athanaſius, when a Boy, at Alexandria, baptized[y] ſome Boys, in the way of boyiſh imitation; by way of *playing*, as we ſhould ſay, at chriſtening. But Biſhop Alexander, by the advice of his Clergy, held the Baptiſm to be *valid*: and would not have the boys re-baptized.—Amongſt the *Schoolmen*, our countryman *Duns*[z] ſpeaks of a diſtinction between *actual*[a] and *habitual* intention, as eſtabliſhed, and propoſes an intermediate ſort, which he calls *virtual*.—Cardinal *Bona*, in his Book on the Maſs[b], ſays, of the Prieſt's intention, "*habitualis* ſufficiens non eſt; *actualis* optima atque laudabilis; ſed non neceſſaria: ſufficit enim *virtualis*, illa nimirùm quæ ab actuali proveniens et non revocata adhuc remanet ſecundùm ſuam virtutem."—I give this ſentence at length in order to ſhew what niceties the ſubject of Intention admits of. Indeed it is ſo far from being limited to *three* ſorts, that it contains

[t] Forbes, 10. 1. 14. [u] Forbes, 10. 1. 27.

[x] See Trent, Seſſ. 14. Chap. 6. about a *Confeſſor* not having a due Intention.

[y] Forbes, 10. 1. 15. from Ruffinus, Sozomen, &c.

[z] Duns Scotus.—See Forbes, 10. 1. 22.

[a] Locke's diſtinction between actual and habitual knowledge, is ſimilar to this; on the underſtanding, 4. 1. 8.

[b] Card. Bona died 1674, Æt. 65:—De Miſsâ, cap. 1. Sect. 5. page 180, col. 2.

contains an infinity of degrees, and an endleſs variety of mixtures.

If all the Romaniſts ſaid no more than that a Prieſt ought to intend what the *Church* intends, it might be taken as meaning only, that whoever acts by *commiſſion*, ought to follow the intention of his *principal*; but in ſome writings compoſed for the *People*, the buſineſs of Intention is much abuſed. We need not a ſtronger inſtance than the Rubric produced by Biſhop Burnet, on the Article.—Biſhop Porteus's account alſo is worthy to be read[c]. —And in the year 1788, a French Proteſtant Clergyman told a friend of mine, that the then Archbiſhop of Paris "had given great offence to the generality of his Clergy by reviving, in a note on one of his *Mandemens*, the doctrine, that the efficacious Grace of the Sacrament was divided into *three Portions*; one of which was for the officiating Prieſt, one for his aſſiſtants, the third for him who received: but that the Prieſt might, if he thought proper, by his *Intentio*, and the private act of his mind, take the laſt portion to himſelf, and cheat the communicant of it."

IV. I will trouble you with no more Hiſtory.

Let us now ſee what may be wanted in the way of *Explanation*.

In this twenty-ſixth Article we muſt conceive the ſubject of Sacraments in general, to be continued. Though what has now been ſaid may ſeem to relate to one or the other Sacrament in particular, yet it ought to relate to one only *as* a Sacrament: if it does that, it may be affirmed of ſacraments *in general*.

The *title* is expreſſed in terms which were uſual at the time: the paſſages cited may ſhew that;

[c] Brief Confutation, page 70.

that; particularly the margin of the Trent Catechiſm.

In this Article it is *ſuppoſed*, that the Miniſters ſpoken of, are though real, yet *unworthy* Miniſters; and that thoſe who receive a Sacrament, are worthy receivers: whereas in the twenty-ninth Article, we ſhall find the Miniſters are ſuppoſed worthy, the receivers unworthy.

For "viſible church," ſee the nineteenth Article, Sect. IV. "Have chief authority"—in Latin it is only "*præſint*," which might ſeemingly have been tranſlated *preſide*. The Engliſh, as it ſtands at preſent, directs our views to the higheſt *Prelates*, but the Latin, to any Miniſter who happens to preſide in giving Sacraments.

The latter paragraph ſeems intended to obviate an objection which might be made to the former. Men might ſay, you eſteem the wickedneſs of Miniſters too lightly: no, ſays the latter paragraph (in effect), the evil of wicked Miniſters is very great and important; but if you apply a wrong remedy to it, you make it ſtill greater.—Puniſh the guilty, not the innocent. Proceed againſt the Miniſters, but do not prevent the people from benefiting by thoſe inſtitutions, which are intended for their Benefit. Let no man be hindered from doing his part; whatever ſtumbling-blocks may lie in his way, every man will be ſure to get good if he does his beſt to proceed in the paths of duty.

The idea of the efficacy of miniſterial acts, has been confounded with that of the duty of Miniſters; certainly it is wrong for Miniſters to be vicious, but if they continue to act by commiſſion from Heaven, benefits may be received through

through their agency[d]. It is *wrong* for any *Magiſtrate* to be vicious, but yet the people may receive redreſs and protection from warrants ſigned by him.

When we ſpeak of "the effect of the ſacraments," we ſhould diſtinguiſh between their effects as ſuch, and their *accidental* effects; a ſacrament given by a good Miniſter, will have more effect in raiſing pious affections, than given by a bad one; but this I call accidental: its effect as a ſacrament, that effect which no ſacrament can fail to produce when intire and regular, will be produced, though the Miniſter be not a good man. This diſtinction, between accidental good effects, and ſuch as may be called eſſential, Auguſtin ſeems to have been maſter of[e].

v. It does not ſeem as if our *Proof* need run into any great length.

'Sacraments are not to be neglected by the People, becauſe they think Miniſters blameable.'

We may look at Matt. vii. 22.—Acts iii. 13.—1 Cor. iii. 5.—or we may, with Biſhop Burnet, uſe the reductio ad abſurdum, and ſay, if faults of Miniſters vitiate ſacraments, a man can never know whether he has been *baptized* or not, or whether he has received the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper; he cannot even know whether he be a Chriſtian.—We may add, that as all men are faulty, there can be no true Church of Chriſt. But the Article itſelf contains ſufficient Proof of what it aſſerts. If an Article contains only propoſitions which are aſſertions, our buſineſs is to give

[d] Trent, Seſſ. 7. Can. 11. we have, "*requiri* intentionem:" now Intention may be required as *Duty*, or in order to *efficacy*; does the Council mean at all to leave ſuch an ambiguity?

[e] See paſſages quoted in Forbes, 10. 2. 14. and 10. 3. 6.

give proofs; but when the propoſitions which an Article contains, are themſelves arguments, or proofs, all additional arguments are ſuperfluous.

Biſhop Burnet alſo reaſons, in the ſame form, on the other point, of the *Intention* of the Prieſt being neceſſary towards the complete effect of a Sacrament. If the ſecret acts of the Prieſt's mind can prevent admiſſion into the Chriſtian Covenant, no one can tell whether he be a Chriſtian or not. Nay, who can tell whether he who acts as a Prieſt be a Chriſtian?—Salvation at the diſcretion of Prieſts, not only good but wicked, is not conceivable.—More need ſcarce be added on ſuch a notion.

VI. We come then to our *Application.*

A form of Aſſent does not ſeem neceſſary; but ſomething may be ſaid on the ſubject of *mutual conceſſions.*—If we take in the ſubject of *Intention*, which does not properly belong to our Article (if it did Du Pin would ſcarcely be ſilent,) we have two adverſaries; on the ſubject of unworthineſs, ſome Diſſenters; on that of Intention, the Romaniſts.

1. To ſuch Diſſenters, or Sectaries, we might grant, that they have good *motives* for aſcribing great evil to the unworthineſs of Miniſters; and that, in one ſenſe, the good effects of Sacraments are really hindered by vicious Clergy; that is, ſacraments ill adminiſtered, make a weaker impreſſion on the heart than when well adminiſtered. And their "ſpiritual Grace" does partly conſiſt in their good effects on the mind according to the natural courſe of things[f].

But then we muſt expect to have it granted, on the other hand, that no man is to *abſent* himſelf from any ſacramental inſtitutions under pretence of

[f] Art. xxv. Sect. 11.

of the wickedneſs or unworthineſs of Miniſters. —That every man is to do his own part in the beſt manner poſſible.—And that a perſon, as an *Agent*, or under a commiſſion, may do *valid* acts, though he be of an immoral private[g] character.

2. To *Romaniſts*, with regard to *Intention*, we may grant, that a mere caſual, jocular ſprinkling, though with a ſacred form of words, does not conſtitute a *Baptiſm*. That the receivers of Sacraments ſhould have reaſon to think, that thoſe who adminiſter, act under commiſſion from God, or Chriſt, or from a religious Society. Whence we are led to call the boyiſh ſprinkling of *Athanaſius*, no Baptiſm, becauſe he could not, whilſt a boy, have any commiſſion to adminiſter Sacraments.

But we muſt expect the Romaniſts to grant, in return, that the people *have* reaſon to think a man regularly commiſſioned, who appears in a ſacred place, habited for ſacred purpoſes, under authority.—We muſt expect to have it allowed, that Salvation, laboured for by Chriſtian obedience, cannot be capriciouſly put out of the reach of the pious and virtuous, the faithful and diligent, by thoſe, who are perhaps more frail than themſelves.

Laſtly, as to *Improvement*, it ſeems as if ſome might be drawn from obſerving caſes in human life, in which men act by commiſſion, where the ſame

[g] Charles Leſlie has a diſcourſe intitled, "who they are that are now qualified to adminiſter Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper." (Works, Vol. 2. fol. page 719).—He ſays ſome Quakers, after reading on Baptiſm, "ſtand chiefly upon the *perſonal holineſs* of the adminiſtrator:" he means *private* virtue; for he ſays, that beſides *perſonal* holineſs, *ſacerdotal* is required:—theſe half-converted Quakers thought, "that the ſpiritual effects of Baptiſm cannot be conveyed by means of an unſanctified inſtrument."—This is to our purpoſe, but the Diſcourſe is chiefly to prove, that Miniſters *ordained* by *Biſhops*, are the perſons duly qualified. The fifth Section, however, page 735, is upon our queſtion.

ſame difficulties occur, but occaſion no diſpute.—An *Ambaſſador* acts for his Sovereign; if he be a worthleſs man his vices do harm, but his acts are *valid*.—They are not valid without ſome kind of *intention*; and he muſt intend what his *Sovereign* intends; yet he may be *abſent* in mind while he is ſigning a treaty; nevertheleſs his inattention will not make his ſignature of no force.

Improvement might alſo ariſe from reflecting how very *practical* ſubjects are, which are treated as ſpeculative. Who maintains any doctrine about unworthineſs or intention of Miniſters, but with ſome farther view?—Let then Practice be profeſſed, and then we can urge, do your beſt; endeavour to prevent unworthineſs of every kind; to prevent men from depending on mere external acts, done without any intention or meaning of virtue or piety. But judge no man.—Indeed it muſt not be denied, that when men do uſe their beſt endeavours to attain the higheſt good, they are liable to great obſtructions and hindrances from others, even in things of a moral and ſpiritual nature: but yet if they act with honeſty and diligence, they may aſſure themſelves that nothing which they do, will be loſt on him to whom they look up for a reward.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXVII.

OF BAPTISM.

BAPTISM is not only a ſign of profeſſion, and mark of difference, whereby Chriſtian men are diſcerned from others that be not chriſtened; but it is alſo a ſign of Regeneration, or New Birth, whereby, as by an inſtrument, they that receive Baptiſm rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promiſes of the forgiveneſs of ſin, and of our adoption to be the ſons of God by the Holy Ghoſt, are viſibly ſigned and ſealed; Faith is confirmed, and Grace increaſed by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptiſm of young Children is in any wiſe to be retained in the Church, as moſt agreeable with the inſtitution of Chriſt.

---

1. The *Hiſtory* of this Article might be very long, and might draw us into a number of Controverſies; I will endeavour to ſelect what is moſt material, and beſt founded. We ſhould nevertheleſs divide our Hiſtory into *two parts*; the firſt relating to Baptiſm without any regard to the *Age* of the perſon baptized: the ſecond relating to the Baptiſm of *Infants*.

11. Firſt of Baptiſm without regard to Age.—Βαπτω ſignifies to tinge, or waſh; βαπτιζω much the ſame; βαπτιζομαι, in the middle voice, is reflective, and implies waſhing one's *ſelf*. Waſhing, as

as a religious rite, is not confined to Chriſtianity; it has been practiſed both by *Heathens* and *Jews*; and probably takes its riſe from the *natural* principles of the human conſtitution. I know not that the natural principles of cleanlineſs, purity, delicacy, and their oppoſites, naſtineſs, filthineſs, &c. have ever been philoſophically analyzed; but men act upon them continually, and recognize the ſentiments which they are adapted to produce.—Mr. *Hume*, in his Eſſays, (Principles of Morals, Sect. 8.) ſpeaks of cleanlineſs as a quality agreeable to *others*, but he ſays nothing of its effects on one's *ſelf*; which nevertheleſs ſeem to be very powerful. Every one makes cleanlineſs a part of merit and excellence: but there is certainly a great connexion between bodily cleanlineſs, and purity of *Heart*. No one ever thought that purity was not acceptable to ſuperior Beings; and thoſe who have worſhipped different ranks of Deities, have always been the more exact in their *Purifications*, the more noble they conceived the Deities to be, to whom they had occaſion to addreſs themſelves.

Perhaps acts of Purification have generally, or always, been *emblematical*; they have been performed as *ſigns* of internal cleanſing from vice: but yet the natural connexion between external and internal purity, makes the repreſentation to operate as a reality: whatever expreſſes purity, promotes it.—Hence it appears natural, that different ſets of men, in different ages and countries, ſhould have agreed in the practice of ablutions and purifications[a].

Any one who wiſhes to ſee a ſhort account of the

[a] Some reaſoning of this *ſort* was made uſe of in the Appendix to the firſt Book, Sect. v—ix.

the *Luſtrations* of the Greeks, may conſult Potter's Antiquities[b].

The diſtinction between clean and unclean, was very ſtrongly marked in the Law of *Moſes*. And the Jewiſh traditions carried it ſtill farther. The ſixth *Order*, or great diviſion, of the *Talmud*, or *Miſna*, is the Order of *Purifications*; in which the rules are very numerous[c] and complicated. But we are moſt concerned with the Jewiſh manner of admitting Proſelytes into their Religion; they uſed circumciſion, if it had not been uſed before, but always[d] *Baptiſm*.

It is worth while to obſerve, that when a Proſelyte was baptized and admitted into the Jewiſh Religion, he was ſaid to be *born again*; his Baptiſm was *regeneration*[e].—And there was ſomething of the ſame ſort amongſt the *Heathens*; a perſon who had been conſidered as dead, on account of long abſence, &c. went through an emblematical *new-birth*, before he recovered his *rights*, or was admitted to certain holy *ordinances*[f].—Nay, Tertullian ſays, Perſons were baptized in the myſteries of Apollo and Ceres, with a view to regeneration and impunity.—(Idque ſe in regenerationem et impunitatem perjuriorum ſuorum agere præſumunt. —Ter. de Baptiſmo, C. 5)[g].

III. In the Chriſtian religion, Baptiſm was uſed

[b] Vol. 1. page 219.—Juſtin Martyr tries to account for the Luſtrations of the Heathens by ſome notion relating to true Chriſtian Baptiſm.—Apol. 1. page 91.—Thirlb. quoted by Middleton, in Letter from Rome, page 139.

[c] See Wotton on the Miſna, Vol. 1. page 160.

[d] Introd. to Wall on Infant Baptiſm.—Wotton on the Miſna, Chap. 8.—But ſee alſo Lardner's Works, Vol. 11. page 320.

[e] See Authorities in Introd. to Wall, Sect. 6.

[f] See Potter, Vol. 1, page 223; Δευτεροποτμοι, or ὑστεροποτμοι. The Authors of the Greek Primitives make the latter to mean, one whoſe funeral pile was built in his life-time.

[g] Wall, page 25, quarto.

uſed from the beginning. "The Law and the Prophets were until John[h]." When John began to preach and baptize, the Chriſtian religion began to be publiſhed; but the Baptiſm of John ſeems only to have been preparatory: he preached, in a very awakening manner, *Repentance*; and he made his diſciples go through a ceremony of purification, expreſſive of Repentance; but all by way of preparing them to acknowledge the great Perſonage who ſhould come after him. He did not pretend to confer the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt[i].

Chriſt himſelf followed. There are ſeveral places of Scripture, in which it is ſaid, that Chriſt[k] baptized; but John iv. 2. ſhews that, in ſome way, it might be ſaid, and at ſome time, that "Jeſus himſelf baptized *not*, but his diſciples[l]." Whoever performed the office, converts were admitted into Chriſtianity by Baptiſm, and ſuch Baptiſm may be called the Baptiſm of Chriſt.—As far as we can judge, it was wiſe to adopt a cuſtom generally received; and one falling in with the natural feelings of all mankind. The Baptiſm of Chriſt differed from that of the Heathens as being the Seal of a contract; for whatever admits any one into a Society, muſt imply conditions and contracting. Nay, this contract was to mankind, of boundleſs extent, and of endleſs duration.—Chriſt is repeatedly ſaid to *baptize with the Holy*[m] *Ghoſt*; poſſibly we may not ſee the full force of the expreſſion; it might be, that

[h] Luke xvi. 16.—Lardner, in the place above-mentioned, thinks, that Baptiſm was *firſt* uſed as an initiation rite, in the Chriſtian Religion, Works, Vol. 2. page 320.

[i] Acts xix. 1—6.

[k] See Matt. iii. 11.—John i. 33.—iii. 22, 26.—iv. 1.

[l] This expreſſion might perhaps bear to be interpreted as a *comparative* phraſe; like Matt. ix. 13. and parallels. If ſo, it would mean, that Jeſus baptized *leſs frequently* than his diſciples.

[m] Matt. iii. 11.—John i. 33.—Acts i. 5.

that the Baptiſm of Chriſt was immediately attended with ſpiritual gifts; as diſtinguiſhed from that of *John*, which was only an emblem of Repentance; or from that of ſucceeding Chriſtians, which ſeems to have been followed by gifts of the Holy[n] Ghoſt, but not always immediately.

Under the ſubject of Confirmation[o], we ſaw ſomething of the manner in which the gifts of the Holy Ghoſt followed Baptiſm at a diſtance, as deſcribed in the Acts of the Apoſtles.—St. Paul has been thought[p] rather to diſclaim the office of baptizing; he does not ſeem to me to do that; he only mentions that preaching was his department; and ſpeaks of baptizing in ſuch an eaſy way, as if he had always baptized when he had had leiſure, and occaſion had ſerved, and as if he had never taken any exact account of thoſe whom he baptized. But yet the number of thoſe he had baptized at *Corinth* when he wrote his firſt Epiſtle, ſeems to us very ſmall; and puts us upon thinking how, from the nature of preaching and baptizing, they muſt interfere much more with each other according to primitive, than according to modern cuſtoms: certainly many could baptize, who could not preach, or govern.

The Baptiſm by *Fire*, Matt. iii. 11[q]. does not ſeem to mean any particular kind of Baptiſm to be deſcribed by an Hiſtorian, or Antiquarian. The expreſſion, "He ſhall baptize you with the Holy Ghoſt and with *Fire*," ſeems of the prophetical kind, and not intended to be underſtood at the time of ſpeaking it. It would excite a ſentiment of dread, immediately after—"hewn down and caſt into the *fire*;"—but it might predict the *fiery*

[n] Acts ii. 38.
[o] Art. xxv. Sect. iii.
[p] 1 Cor. i. 14. 17.
[q] Και πυρι is omitted in ſeveral Manuſcripts.

fiery tongues which ſate upon the Apoſtles: compare Acts i. 5[r].

The Baptiſm of Chriſt, and that of his followers, ſeem ſtill *emblematical*.—This is well deſcribed by *Cyprian*[s], where he ſays, there is no need of "ſoap and other helps, and a large pool," &c,

IV. The early Fathers ſeem to ſpeak as if Baptiſm had been always, that is, in all ordinary caſes, in ancient times, performed by *immerſion* of the whole body; performed any where, at any Pond or River; till Baths were made for the purpoſe, in buildings on the outſide of churches, which were called *Baptiſteries*.—If we conſider how very ſhort and general the directions of ſcripture are with regard to Baptiſm, and how few circumſtances are related in the narrations, we ſhall not wonder if we find very great variety in the ancient rites of baptiſm before Churches were regulated by civil Laws.—Irenæus's account of the Valentinians is tranſlated by Wall[t]; but, without repeating their extravagances, we may mention, that frequently Baptiſm uſed, amongſt ſober Chriſtians, to be preceded by *Prayer* and *Faſting*[u]:—that the Head of the Perſon in the water, was put under water three times, in which caſe writers uſe the expreſſion, *trine immerſion*: it ſeems, at firſt, as if this ceremony had ariſen from the Form of baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt; but yet, for ſome reaſon or other, a cuſtom of immerging three times, has prevailed,

[r] Thoſe who are moſt converſant in oriental idiom might inform us, whether Holy Ghoſt *and* fire, could mean the ſame as the Holy Ghoſt aſſuming a *fiery* appearance?

[s] Wall. page 464, quarto, from Ep. 69.—This is applicable to the ſubject of *ſprinkling*, Sect. x.

[t] Part 2. Chap. v. Sect. 1.

[u] Wall, Part 2. Chap. ix.

prevailed, both amongſt the Heathens[x] and the Jews[y]. The trine immerſion afterwards got into diſrepute, on account of ſome Heretics who uſed it, and was ordered to be left off, by a Council held at Toledo[z].—After Baptiſm, a mixture of *milk and honey* uſed to be given, and a *white garment* put on; all theſe were emblematical. Some *unction* uſed to be practiſed: and the ceremony was never performed without an abrenunciation of the *Devil*, and ſome profeſſion of *Faith*.—I mentioned Exorciſm under a former Article, and how ſoon Baptiſm was ſometimes followed by Confirmation.

It uſed to be reckoned, that *Martyrdom* ſupplied the place of Baptiſm; that is, that if a convert, who had not been baptized, ſuffered Martyrdom for the Chriſtian religion, his martyrdom would complete his admiſſion into the Church of Chriſt, as much as Baptiſm would have done: and particular reaſons and analogies were urged in favour of the notion.—As the perſon baptized is wetted with water, ſo is the Martyr with his own blood[a]: &c.

v. The rites of Baptiſm uſed in the *Greek* Church, may be found in Sir Paul *Ricaut's*[b] preſent State, &c. and an account of their grand annual Purification may be ſeen in *Cave's* Appendix, before referred to, under the word ἁγιασμος: and

[x] Potter's Antiquities, Vol. 1. page 221. 223. Idem *ter* ſocios purâ circumtulit undâ, Æn. 6. 229.—Terque ſenem flammâ, ter aquâ, ter ſulphure luſtrat. Ovid Metam. lib. 7. cap. 2.—In the latter paſſage the word *flamma* reminds one of the ſcriptural baptizing with *fire*; though no way probably connected with it.

[y] See Wall's Introd. page lxi. and page 488.

[z] See Sparrow's Rationale, page 260.

[a] Wall, Part 2. Chap 9. Sect. 2. page 466. quarto.

[b] Chap. 7.

and one chapter in Bingham's Hiſtory of Lay-baptiſm, is about the Greek Church.

VI. The *Romaniſts* profeſs, that pure *water* is the only proper[d] matter of Baptiſm; yet by rules built on tradition, they uſe holy *Chriſm:* they alſo uſe Exorciſm, Salt, Spittle, the white Garment, and burning the wax-light: and ſign *eight* parts of the body (reckoning the eyes *two*,) with the ſign of the[e] Croſs.—They conſider Baptiſm as valid by whomſoever[f] performed, Layman, Jew, Infidel, Woman, &c. but only in caſes of neceſſity; that is, they had rather have a perſon baptized irregularly than not at all. Heretics who adminiſter baptiſm in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and who *intend* what the Church intends, are held to baptize effectually, without any conſideration of neceſſity[g].

VII. The *Reformed* churches ſhew their abhorrence for Popery by departing more or leſs from the Romiſh cuſtoms. Thoſe who think that the Church of England has not carried Reformation far enough, ſpeak with a kind of horror of any Baptiſm whatever performed by[h] Women. And direct the ceremony not to be performed where Popiſh Fonts[i] uſed to be ſuperſtitiouſly placed; they alſo omit the ſign of the *croſs*, and are much ſcandalized by it in others. The *Lutherans* are ſaid, on the other hand, to uſe exorciſm; the *Engliſh*, according to their uſual moderation, dropped moſt popiſh ceremonies by *degrees*, (ſee Wall, page 470.—Puller, page 281.) and probably ſooner than

[d] Trent Catech. Sect. 11. or 7.
[e] Ibid. Sect. 61, &c. [f] Ibid. Sect. 22.
[g] Council of Trent, Seſſion 7, 4th Canon on Baptiſm.
[h] Scotch Confeſſion, Chap. 22. imò, quod magis eſt *horrendum*, fœminis baptizare permittunt. Syntagma, page 154, ſecond paging.
[i] Directory.

than they would have done, had all their Divines ſtaid at home, or none of them gone to *Geneva*, &c. but they ſtill uſe *Fonts*, with the ſign of the Croſs.

VIII. Charles *Leſlie*, a celebrated writer againſt the Quakers, ſays, that no one ſpoke againſt water-baptiſm before *George Fox*, whom he places in the year 1650[k].—And Archbiſhop *Secker*[l] ſays, that a "Sect (meaning the Quakers) ſprung up amongſt us within a little more than 100 years, deny" the ſacred appointment of water: But it ſeems to me, that ſome of the ancient heretics had the ſame turn of thought with our modern Quakers; the ſame way of underſtanding, or rather, of feeling, the Scriptures[m]. For there is a ſort of *temper*, which, in any age, if not corrected, will bring men to aim at being all ſpirit. *Quintilla* ſeems to have had this quakeriſh turn; and was a ſelf-commiſſioned female teacher[n]: a great rarity, I fancy, in ancient times.—The Council of Trent has a Canon againſt the denyers of Water-baptiſm; ſuch therefore exiſted[o].

IX. The *Socinians* have been mentioned before as allowing but one ceremonial præceptum of Chriſt, an injunction to break bread[p].—They conſider

[k] On Water-Baptiſm, end of Sect. 11.—Works, Vol. 2, page 679. Charles Leſlie was a proteſtant adherent to the Pretender in 1714; and would have converted him from Popery.

[l] Lecture 35. page 222.

[m] Compare Barclay's Apology, page 386, Edit. Birm. with what was ſaid in Art. XXV. of the Aſcodrutæ, &c.—See alſo Aug. Hær. 59.—Wall, 2. 7. 7.—But with regard to the Manichean Baptiſm, Wall, 2. 5. 3. and Lardner, Vol. 3. page 490, are of contrary opinions.

[n] See Wall, Part 2. Chap. 5. Sect. 2.

[o] Canon 2. of Seſſ. 7. (de Baptiſmo.)

[p] Art. XXV. Sect. 11. from Racovian Catechiſm, page 143. —And Ep. to Radecius in Socinus's Works, fol. Vol. 1. page 380, 383, 384.

ſider *Baptiſm* as a viſible ceremony, admitting men into Chriſtianity, when they have been Jews, or Pagans; but not to be uſed in a *Family already Chriſtian.*—Fauſtus Socinus has written a treatiſe on Baptiſm[q].

The *Jews* had a notion like this of the Socinians[r].

x. I will only mention one thing more before I proceed to the Hiſtory of Infant-Baptiſm; and that is, the cuſtom of *ſprinkling* or *pouring* water on the perſon baptized; or the cuſtom of partial immerſion, as ſupplanting, in ſome countries, that of total immerſion. The Baptiſts do diſtinguiſh between ſprinkling and pouring, but to no end that I can perceive. Indeed more attention has been paid to the diſtinction between dipping and ſprinkling, than it appears to me to deſerve: two modes of performing an emblematical act, may be equally good, if they be equally adapted to circumſtances.

Wall ſays, that Mr. *Walker* has ſtudied this ſubject of aſperſion, affuſion, &c. more diligently than any other perſon[s].

In early times of Chriſtianity, Baptiſm was performed by immerſion, ordinarily, but *clinic* Baptiſm was always, probably, performed by affuſion, or pouring: though it was reckoned to leave a man in ſome reſpects leſs qualified for ſome public offices.—Wall quotes a good[t] inſtance out of *Cyprian:* he alſo mentions the caſe of a *Priſoner.* But

[q] See Voſſius de Baptiſmo.

[r] See Wall on Infant-Baptiſm, Introd. Sect 3. and 5. or the laſt chapter of the Book, page 524, quarto.—Introd. page 1.

[s] See Wall, page 470, quarto, the title of Walker's Book is, "Doctrine of Baptiſms"

[t] Part 2. Chap. 9. Sect. 2. page 464, quarto: quoted Sect. x.—It is ſcarcely needful to ſay, that *clinic* Baptiſm is Baptiſm of thoſe who keep their beds.

But ſo far, affuſion was only allowed in clinic baptiſm, or in caſes of neceſſity.

Near the end of the fifth Century, *Gennadius* of Marſeilles[u] ſpeaks as if it was an *indifferent* matter whether a man were wetted with water, or plunged into it; but he is the firſt who does ſo. Indeed the cuſtom of immerſion was firſt left off in France, and laſt in England; in the time of Queen Elizabeth.—But ſtill it is ſaid, that all Countries continue the practice of immerſion, except the Weſtern or Latin Church; except thoſe, who are, or have been, under the Government of the Pope.—It is natural that the cuſtom of ſprinkling ſhould gain ground, as being more commodious than immerſion, eſpecially in cold[x] Countries: ſome very eminent men of our own country, have however been deſirous to reſtore the practice of immerſion, in ordinary caſes[y]. It is favoured by our Rubric.

XI. We come now to the Hiſtory of *Infant*-baptiſm.

As the cuſtom of baptizing in general, ſo that of baptizing Infants in particular, ſeems to have had ſome foundation in the Nature of man.—Parents are anxious that their offſpring ſhall be ſecured from dangers, and put in a way to obtain advantages, as ſoon as poſſible. And the ſame motives which impel parents to admit their children into the Family of a Maſter, in the way of Apprenticeſhip, or into any literary Society for the purpoſe of education, impel them to make their children members of Chriſt, in order that they may

[u] De eccleſ. dogm. cap. 74.

[x] In Ruſſia, it is ſaid, Children are bathed in cold water; yet, generally ſpeaking, Immerſion may ſuit the warmeſt climates beſt.

[y] Wall, Part 2. Chap. 9. Sect. 2. page 474, quarto.

may be inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.—By the Law of Nature, a Parent makes any engagement for his Son, during minority, which his Son would make for himſelf, if fully informed of the benefits reſulting from it: and if any bond or ſecurity is to be given, it muſt be given by the parent. Would then a youth, if for the moment enlightened, and informed of all the benefits reſulting from Chriſtianity, and of the hazards of neglecting it, be baptized or not? on the anſwer depends the rectitude of baptizing a youth during his minority[z]. – But theſe moral remarks muſt not here be purſued farther than is requiſite to ſet the *Hiſtory* of Infant-Baptiſm in a right point of view[a].

Amongſt *Heathens*, there was ſuch a thing as Luſtration[b] of Infants: which was accompanied, both amongſt Greeks and Romans, with the giving of a *name*.

Amongſt the *Jews*, circumciſion was performed on the eighth day after the birth, and a *name* was given[c] at that time—And what was before mentioned, from Wall's Introduction, about their baptizing Proſelytes, may be extended to Children; as Wall proves from Jewiſh writings[d]: the Jews had moreover, a reference to our moral principle, the good of the child[e]; and they expected

Jews

[z] Minority, in any one affair, if not fixed by Civil Laws, muſt mean the time, from birth, during which a perſon is unable to judge for himſelf, in that particular affair.

[a] This was farther explained in my Lectures on Dr. Balguy's Moral Syllabus, Part 2. Chap. 3. Sect. 1. Subſect. 1. 35. and Subſect. 2. 3.——But both the Syllabus and the Explanation are in MS.

[b] See Wheatly on the Common Prayer.——Office of Baptiſm, page 360.

[c] Gen. xxi. 3, 4.——Luke i. 59, 60.—ii. 21.

[d] See Introd. Sect. 3. 5. and Sect. 11. of this Art.

[e] Wall's Introd. Sect. 3.

Jews to be baptized on the coming of *Elias* or *Chriſt*[f].

XII. But the moſt difficult matter to ſettle is, how the *Chriſtians* acted, in early times. with regard to the baptizing of infants. Wall's Hiſtory of Infant-Baptiſm ſeems to me an excellent book; clear, learned, rational, candid, unaffected; and I ſhould add, ſpeaking from my own experience, lively: I ſincerely recommend it; not only on account of the information it gives with regard to infant-baptiſm, but as laying open Chriſtian Antiquity in general, and treating, in a maſterly way, many ſubjects uſeful to a Divine[g]. Nevertheleſs I do not pretend that it removes all doubts whatſoever, even on its principal ſubject.—With regard to the *Scriptures*, what can be deduced from them lies in a ſmall compaſs. On the one hand, they mention *no inſtance* of infant-baptiſm; on the other, they afford no inſtance of baptiſm being *delayed*. Some *Families* are ſpoken of collectively, as being baptized, but the *children*, are not mentioned particularly[h].

XIII. How ſoon any accounts of infant-baptiſm, appear in reputable writers, is a matter in diſpute. Some Pædobaptiſts have, in their candour, allowed a longer time before any appear, than

[f] This is affirmed at the concluſion of Wall's Introduction, but I ſee no proofs; they may be in Selden, Lightfoot, &c. however, the notion makes the meſſage of the Jews, John i. 19—25, intelligible. Who art thou that baptizeſt *Jews?*—Jews *need* not be baptized till Chriſt, or at leaſt Elias, come: art thou then the *Chriſt?* or art thou *Elias?* or who art thou?

[g] This Book was before recommended, at the opening of the Pelagian Controverſy.—Art. IX. Sect. VIII.

[h] Acts x. 48. and xvi. 15. 33. and 1 Cor. 1. 16.—See moreover Acts ii. 41. and viii. 12, or 16; where numbers are baptized in which muſt probably be ſome children.

than others have approved of.—Bingham[i] begins his evidences from the earlieſt times; ſo indeed does Wall; but the firſt proofs are only by implication[k]. To theſe writers I muſt refer you: the ſubſtance of the proofs is well collected in a ſhort popular dialogue done by Wall from his larger work, and intitled, "A *Conference* between two Men that had doubts about Infant-Baptiſm."—From this I may read a few words about the firſt centuries[l].—What I ſhall attempt is to give you ſome of the moſt remarkable things in the Hiſtory, and ſuch as have had the moſt influence on mens opinions.

XIV. 1. No diſpute or controverſy was ever held in ancient times concerning our ſubject; all the paſſages produced in evidence, are incidental[m].

2. Several perſons are ſpoken of in Hiſtory as having been baptized *late in life:* now when it appears, on examination, that ſuch perſons were themſelves converts from Paganiſm, there is no great difficulty; but when they appear to have been born of *Chriſtian Parents*, it is not ſo eaſy to account for the delay: however, there is another thing to be inquired into; whether the parents were baptized before the children were born; if not, one may ſee, that ſuch as were unbaptized themſelves, would ſcarcely baptize their children in infancy, if they

[i] Book 11th.

[k] The manner in which Wall *inveſtigates* the practices of the Apoſtolic Age, has been already mentioned under Art. XXIV.

[l] Conference, page 72.

[m] Auguſtin ſays, that the Doctrines of the Trinity and Repentance, and Baptiſm, and Unity of the Church, were never fully opened till they were controverted; (ſee Art. 1. Sect. IV.) we may obſerve, that the reaſon why the practice of Infant-Baptiſm was never fully opened, was, becauſe it was never controverted:—And we call every mention of Infant-Baptiſm incidental, which occurs when that ſubject is not the point in diſpute.

they could avoid it. That ſome converts did delay their Baptiſm, is clear from Martyrdom[n] being thought equivalent to Baptiſm; and from Gregory of Nazianzum preaching againſt ſuch delay:—but it ſeems as if our adverſaries ſpoke of ſome inſtances without ſufficient proof[o].

3. One thing which makes paſſages in ancients ſeem leſs to our purpoſe than they really are, is the variety of names by which Baptiſm is called; as, *Regeneration*, *Renewal*, *Sanctification*, *Illumination*, the *Seal*, the *Grace*, &c. and the originals of theſe words are ſometimes tranſlated by other Engliſh words:—theſe are mentioned in Wall's Preface; in Theodoret I find ἀπολυτρωσις[p]: Wall quotes it from Irenæus[q].

4. Juſtin Martyr, who lived about forty years after the death of St. John, diſcourſes "of baptiſm being to us inſtead of *circumciſion*[r]:—Irenæus near forty years later, mentions infants as "by Chriſt *born again* unto God."—Origen, about fifty years later ſtill, "does, in ſeveral places, ſpeak of infant-baptiſm as a known and undoubted practice: and (in one of them) as having been, according to a *tradition*, ordered by the Apoſtles[s]."

5. The greateſt difficulty ariſes from *Tertullian*, who is placed about 100 years after St. John's death, and therefore before Origen. He, in his Book de Baptiſmo, cap. 18. diſſuades (and he is the only Father who does diſſuade) from early baptiſm, though he ſeems as much afraid of any one's *dying*

[n] Sect. IV.

[o] The notion reſults from reading Wall's Book.—Gregory of Nazianzum preaches againſt delaying Baptiſm, Orat. 40. or, de Baptiſmo, for which ſee Wall, Part 1. Chap. 11.

[p] Hæret. Fab. 1. 10. [q] Part 2. Chap. 5. Sect. 1.

[r] Conference, page 72.

[s] Wall, page 27, quarto, or Part 1. Chap. 5. Sect. 3.

dying unbaptized, as any writer: that is, he adviſes putting off Baptiſm till the age of *Reaſon*; but only on this ſuppoſition, that there is no danger of death. By diſſuading he acknowledges the *practice*, however difficult it may be to account for his diſſuading; and the opinion of a ſingle man, who in ſeveral things was excentric, is not of ſo much conſequence as the practice. But it ſeems odd he ſhould not know, as well as Origen, of the Tradition, that infant-baptiſm had been ordered by the Apoſtles.—Many things are ſaid, with great good ſenſe as it appears to me, to account for this ſingular phænomenon; and it is ſhewn how much better opportunies Origen had of learning what the Apoſtles had ſaid, than Tertullian; but what occurs to me does not ſeem to have been mentioned by others, and therefore I am diffident about it.—He ſeems to me to be, when he adviſes putting off Baptiſm to the age of reaſon, *growing* a *Montaniſt*; the followers of Montanus "did not allow the Church the power to forgive great Sins *after*[t] *Baptiſm*;" — Tertullian himſelf held *mæchia* to be "immundabile vitium." Now the only reaſon for which he diſſuades from early Baptiſm, ſeems to me to be an horror of ſin after baptiſm: and he particularly diſſuades ſingle perſons, and young widows, as being moſt likely to yeild to carnal luſt. The auſtere temper of a Montaniſt ſeems likely alſo to make a man dread any one's *dying* without baptiſm, at the ſame time that it makes him dread baptizing: ſuch inconſiſtencies are apt to attend exceſſive paſſions; not leſs thoſe of a moroſe kind than any others.

We may here mention *Fidus's* application to Cyprian, (who is placed in the year 248,) though it

[t] Art. XVI. Sect. II.—From Lardner's Works, Vol. 9. page 489.

it is only the misrepresentation of it which has occasioned any difficulty. Fidus desired to be informed whether he might, in any case, baptize a child *before the eighth day*; the answer was, yes, if it be in *danger*; if there be *necessity*. This is represented as if no infant, even *after* the eighth day, was to be baptized except in cases of *necessity*.—Whereas Fidus had had no difficulty *after* the eighth day; he had baptized commonly; but the rite of circumcision, corresponding to Baptism, having been delayed till the eighth day, together with the objection or disgust which some might have to giving a very young child the Kiss of Peace, and other reasons, not very forcible, made him doubt, whether, even supposing there was some danger, he should baptize. Children though in danger, had not been circumcised, that he knew of, sooner than the eighth day.

6. *Augustin* lived about 200 years after Tertullian; he very *frequently* speaks of infant-baptism, though incidentally. And says, that he *never heard* of any "Christian, Catholic or Sectary, who taught any other doctrine but that Infants are to be baptized[u] [for pardon of sin]."—The Pelagians (incidentally) allow the same[x].—It seems strange, that neither they nor Augustin should ever have seen Tertullian's Book de Baptismo. I do not see that Wall solves this difficulty. I can conceive, that Tertullian might not *occur* to Augustin when he made his assertion; and for this reason; because the ruling idea in Augustin's mind was not infant-baptism, but the danger of suffering from original sin; about which danger Tertullian was no adversary.

7. The case of *Gregory of Nazianzum* is not free from difficulty. He says, in an Oration about Baptism,

[u] Conference, page 48.

[x] Ib. page 48, 49.

Baptiſm, that if infants are out of all danger of dying, his *own* opinion is, that they ſhould be baptized when they are about *three years* old. An opinion, as Wall remarks, " which would pleaſe neither the Pædobaptiſt nor Antipædobaptiſt."—The Pædobaptiſt however ſees, that the cuſtom of baptizing infants, is here allowed, as a *fact*; and urges, that a child is no more capable of contracting when he is three years old, than when three weeks old. All objections of any force are againſt a child's being baptized during what may be called its *minority* in religious matters. This is what occurs if we conſider Gregory's ſentence by itſelf: but it ſhould be conſidered with the context.

There is certainly ſomething extraordinary in this private opinion of Gregory's; ſomething which has a *ſolution*, if one could but find it out. —The Oration is a forcible harangue againſt *deferring* baptiſm; the *pretences* for deferring it, are anſwered; and with regard to *children*, the preacher urges, Νηπιον εστι σοι; μη λαβετω καιρον ἡ κακια, εκ βρεφους ἁγιασθητω, εξ ονυχων καθιερωθητω τω πνευματι:— and then he propoſes to Mothers the example of *Hannah*, who made *Samuel* holy immediately, as ſoon as he was born, (γενυηθεντα ἱερον ευθυς ποιει): and immediately after delivering his notion about three years, he ſpeaks of the ſudden dangers to which an human being is ſubject, and adviſes ſecuring infants againſt them by means of Baptiſm. —How is it then that this peculiar notion comes in amidſt directions which ſeem inconſiſtent with it? Wall conſiders it as a compliment to the preacher's Father[y]; which, from certain circumſtances, ſeems no groundleſs conjecture.—We know ſo little of the minutiæ of Gregory's Hiſtory, that we ſeem unlikely to go farther than to ſee

[y] Wall about *Cæſarius*, page 306, quarto.

ſee an *inconſiſtency*; from which one may venture to conclude, that the notion of three years had ſome *extraordinary* origin: that it was not a natural conception, agreeable to the ſcope of the diſcourſe, not the genuine offspring of Gregory's unbiaſſed underſtanding[z].

To dwell on more particulars, would exceed our *limits*; I have laid before you every thing (as far as I know) that ſeems *againſt* the cuſtom of baptizing infants; the hiſtorical authorities *for* that cuſtom are too numerous and extenſive to be given: for them I muſt refer to Wall; I believe you may conclude all the numerous authorities which I have not mentioned, to be *in favour* of Infant-Baptiſm. In general, it may be mentioned, that infant-baptiſm was never ordered or enjoined by any *Council*; was never inſerted in any *Creed*; and that all eſtabliſhed *national* Churches have practiced it.—Peter *Bruis* (perhaps Bruce), a Frenchman, whoſe followers were called *Petrobruſſians*, is thought by Wall to have been (with one *Henry*) the firſt Antipædobaptiſt teacher who formed a *Church* about A. D. 1030. The German Anabaptiſts are placed in A. D. about 1420: theſe were mentioned formerly: if there was any continuation of doctrine from the Petrobruſſians to them, it was obſcure, and held by a few men. The aim of both was to *reform:* to improve religion, and make the Church of Chriſt perfect in practice as well as in theory.—The Anabaptiſts were ſlow in getting footing in *England:* Neal places their firſt

[z] *Robinſon* ſays, this Oration was delivered to an audience in which were many perſons *unbaptized*: that muſt be true; at leaſt there muſt have been enow to make it worth while to perſuade to Baptiſm: but yet by far the greateſt part of thoſe Parents who were themſelves baptized, might baptize their children in infancy. If Infant-Baptiſm was unuſual amongſt ſuch, Gregory could not have uſed the language he does.

firſt congregation or Church, in England, in the year 1640. Probably Cromwell found them of uſe, and encouraged them. Mr. *Tombs* is reckoned their beſt writer.

Servetus, who ſuffered death at Geneva in 1553, on the proſecution of Calvin, cenſured infant-baptiſm "with the utmoſt ſeverity." (Moſh. Cent. 16. 3. 2. 4. 5.)

Here it may be proper to mention the ſubject of *Sponſors*. Suſceptores, or Sponſors, have been uſed in Baptiſm for a great length of time; Bingham (11. 8. 1.) divides them into three ſorts.

1. Thoſe who anſwered for Infants.

2. Thoſe who anſwered for infirm perſons, unable to anſwer for themſelves.

3. Thoſe who attended at the Baptiſm of Adults, as *witneſſes*, and thereby received a commiſſion to remind them of their baptiſmal vow.

In the Baptiſm of Adults, the Sponſors with us are uſed as witneſſes only; and as perſons authorized to remind the newly-baptized of his baptiſmal vow.—It does indeed ſeem improper that ſuch a ſolemn act as Baptiſm, making ſuch a change in a man's condition, ſhould go unatteſted, or be left to caſual teſtimony: and as reproof or advice to adults, though they conſtantly want it, is impertinent from thoſe who have no authority to give it, there is an evident utility in the Church's commiſſioning ſome friend to ſuggeſt occaſionally a friendly admonition, in ſpiritual affairs.

Wall ſhews that Sponſors were in uſe amongſt the *Jews*, when they baptized Proſelytes.—(See Part 2. 10. 17.)

I do not recollect whether the *Puritans* had any Sponſors:—In the Comedy called *the Puritan*, amongſt Shakſpeare's works, they are called "*Ungodmothered* varlets."

And

And now, what is the *reſult* of the facts here ſtated?

1. Could they have happened on a ſuppoſition that Chriſtians always baptized infants? or, that there never was a time, ſince Chriſtianity was publiſhed, when ſome infants were not baptized? yes, they might:—the ſilence of Scripture, conſidering how very ſmall its[a] records are, is conſiſtent with the practice: thouſands muſt have been baptized at one age or other, whoſe baptiſm is never mentioned: more important events demanded the pen of the Hiſtorian, than the Baptiſm of the infant-children of thoſe converts who had been themſelves baptized.

2. Could the facts have been as we find them, ſuppoſing all Chriſtians had been plainly and poſitively commanded, by written edict, to baptize their children in infancy? I think not. Neither Tertullian nor Gregory of Nazianzum would, in that caſe, have preſumed to occaſion any delay.

3. Are the facts conſiſtent with the ſuppoſition, that all Chriſtians might baptize infants if they pleaſed? yes; I ſee no marks of any prohibition, or diſcouragement.

4. Laſtly, could the facts have been as we find them, ſuppoſing that as many Chriſtians left infants unbaptized, as baptized them? I think not; the evidence ſhews the *majority* of thoſe who baptized infants, to be very great.

On the whole, it is probable, that many parents, &c. baptized children, in all ages of the church; very many, in ſome: but that none were compelled to baptize them in any age.

In ſpeaking of infant-baptiſm we have paid no attention

[a] In Paley's Horæ Paulinæ, we find ſeveral inſtances of events relating to the Apoſtles, which are not recorded in the Acts of the Apoſtles.

attention to the difference between immerſion and ſprinkling; but as what was ſaid before on ſprinkling related to Baptiſm in general, or without regard to age, it muſt relate to all particular ſorts of baptiſm.—Therefore we may content ourſelves with obſerving, that there has been a *trine ſprinkling*[b] as well as a trine immerſion; and that ſprinkling may be more eaſily juſtified in baptizing Infants, than Adults; becauſe immerſion has an effect upon the feelings and ſentiments of adults, but no mental effect upon Infants.

XV. I will here inſert an obſervation or two on what may be called *irregular* Baptiſm; ſuch as occaſions a doubt whether a perſon ſhall be re-baptized.—We ſaid ſomething allied to this, under the twenty-third Article: and under the preſent, when deſcribing the notions of Romiſh Church and the reformed churches. The ſubject is very copious, as any one finds, who reads Bingham's Hiſtory of Lay-baptiſm.

Some ancient Chriſtians uſed to re-baptize thoſe perſons, more than once, whoſe firſt baptiſm they themſelves accounted valid; theſe were the moſt ſtrictly Anabaptiſts: the Chriſtians whom we call Anabaptiſts in modern times, baptize thoſe over again who were baptized in infancy; but it is becauſe they look upon infant-baptiſm as not valid. Hence they chuſe to be called not Anabaptiſts, but *Baptiſts*.—The followers of Marcion uſed to baptize, in their own way, more than once: and we now ſee old people who wiſh to be *confirmed* repeatedly.—Wall ſays, he knows of no other ancient Chriſtians beſides the Marcionites who reiterated their own Baptiſm.—(Part 2. Chap. 5. Sect. 5.)

Irregularities

[b] Wall, page 468, quarto.

Irregularities may ariſe from *place*, *time*, *matter*, &c. but thoſe ſeem moſt attended to, which ariſe from the want of due qualifications in the *perſons* who baptize. Theſe may be inferior orders of Miniſters, as Deacons; or the aſſiſtant Miniſters mentioned Article xxv. Sect. v. Subdeacons, Readers, Acolythiſts, &c.—or degraded Prieſts, become Laymen; or confeſſed Laymen, or Women. The validity of Baptiſm may alſo become doubtful from its being adminiſtered by heretical Miniſters, though that is becauſe ſuch are deemed no miniſters at all[c].—In our own country, Midwives have been allowed to baptize, in caſes of neceſſity: Neal[d] gives us a Form of a Licence for that purpoſe, and ſays, with ſome ſurprize, that notwithſtanding ſuch licences were given, Biſhop Whitgift affirmed, "that Baptiſm by Women and Lay-perſons was not allowed by the Church." The caſe was, that an ambiguous Rubric had divided the learned[e], and Whitgift probably ſpoke his real opinion.

As a full Hiſtory of irregular Baptiſm would detain us too long, I muſt content myſelf with a few general remarks; the reſult, as it were, of Hiſtory.

But we muſt diſtinguiſh between authorizing certain perſons beforehand to perform any ſacred act in certain extraordinary caſes, and confirming acts on looking back upon them, which have not only been irregular, but have been performed without any previous authority. Acts authorized muſt be

[c] Marcionites and Pepuzians are mentioned by Rogers, page 141, with reference to Epiphan. Hær. 52, in regard to Baptiſm by non-miniſters.

[d] See Hampton Court Conference in 1603.

[e] See an account of this Rubric in Bingham's Hiſtory of Lay-Baptiſm, Chap. 3. Sect. 5.—Works, Vol. 2, page 567.

be confirmed, however irregular; but doubt may ariſe about a perſon having gone beyond what he was authorized to do. The greateſt difficulty, however muſt ariſe in debating, 1. Whether any act is to be authorized; 2. When an unauthorized act is to be confirmed.

1. When we debate about authorizing certain perſons to baptize in extraordinary caſes, our inquiry muſt turn on this; which is the *leaſt evil*; to let a man infringe the rights, and intrude into the province of the ſacred miniſtry; or to let men die unbaptized, in original ſin.—The Scotch Church is ſhocked at the idea of Women baptizing; the Directory forbids all private Baptiſm[f]; if they feel no ſhock at the thoughts of an human being not becoming a Chriſtian when he might, they act conſiſtently; but ought they not to allow. that others may be as much ſhocked at the latter evil as they are at the former? if a caſe is really one of neceſſity, there is no alternative but irregular baptiſm, or dying in a ſtate of Heatheniſm choſen voluntarily.

2. When ſacred acts have been performed without authority, people are apt to reaſon as if they could lay down rules for neceſſity: but neceſſity knows no law. Whoever acts in caſes of neceſſity, according to the beſt of his judgment and with an honeſt intention, muſt act rightly; and what he does, ought to be confirmed. Men may diſpute hiſtorically about Baptiſm in caſes of neceſſity, in order to determine what has been done: but if men

[f] *Puller* ſays, "the Directory did forbid very uncharitably all private Baptiſm: notwithſtanding moſt of its followers nowadays admit only private Baptiſms."—Moderation of the Church of England, London 1679, page 280.—The Directory was approved by the Aſſembly of Divines in 1645.—For the Scotch Church, ſee Syntagma, page 154, cap. 22.

men under neceſſity act bonâ fide for the beſt; if they return to rule as ſoon as they are able, and make what compenſation they are able for damage ariſing from their acts; it ſignifies nothing to them what the Romaniſts, or what the Calviniſts have ſettled; they are right; and thoſe who annul their acts, are wrong.

3. But as diſputes may ariſe about the effects of Baptiſm in caſes of neceſſity, would it not be beſt to have ſome ordinance for admitting thoſe, who have been irregularly baptized, to regular Baptiſm? ſuch ordinance need not aſſert that the former baptiſm is invalid; but only ſay, that *if* it be ſo in any degree, there is now a completion given to it; we have ſuch a Form in the Church of England when it is not ſufficiently proved that private Baptiſm has been performed. Indeed the whole reception of one privately baptized into the Church, may be conſidered as a completion of an irregular baptiſm. And in our civil government, when a meaſure has been taken during a receſs of Parliament, enjoined only by Proclamation, &c. I believe it is always confirmed by parliamentary authority at the enſuing Seſſion[g].

XVI. If I have ſeemed too prolix on this Hiſtory of Baptiſm, it muſt be conſidered that Hiſtory here

[g] Dr. Burn, under *Baptiſm*, ſays, from Biſhop Fleetwood, that there has been no law in England to forbid, or invalidate *Lay-Baptiſm* in caſes of neceſſity: he ſuppoſes it good, and underſtands that a perſon ſo baptized is not to be re-baptized.—After the Reſtoration he ſuppoſes there might be in Wales two or three hundred thouſand perſons who had received only Lay-baptiſm.

Neal gives (1661), as one of the things ſettled by the Commiſſioners for reviewing the Common Prayer, (page 612, quarto) —"10. Private Baptiſm is not to be adminiſtered but by a lawful Miniſter." ——Hiſtory of Puritans, quarto, Vol. 2. page 614.

here anſwers two purpoſes; it not only relates facts, but it contains arguments. Beſides, the Hiſtory of Baptiſm has been, of late, in my opinion, much miſrepreſented; and in a manner likely to do harm. I mean by the late Mr. *Robinſon*, Baptiſt teacher[h] at Cambridge. It came in my way, on a former[i] occaſion, to ſhew how he miſrepreſented Auguſtin; ſomething of the ſame ſort may be expected now. But, in truth, Wall has already anſwered him; and to ſee his miſrepreſentations, nothing more is needful than to look into a book to which he himſelf refers.—I have mentioned the caſes of thoſe who were baptized[k] late in life, that of Cyprian[l] with Fidus, of Tertullian[m], Auguſtin's[n] ignorance of Tertullian's advice; and the caſe of Gregory of Nazianzum[o]; theſe are the ſtrongeſt things againſt Infant-Baptiſm that I know of in Antiquity, and theſe are ſpecimens ſufficient. Let any one then who wiſhes to ſtudy the Hiſtory of Baptiſm, *compare* Robinſon's account of theſe, with Wall's; I deſire nothing more. But what are we to think of a perſon who propoſes, in an earneſt way, arguments to which he himſelf has read complete anſwers?—I ſpeak only to thoſe who, with myſelf, think them undeniably ſuch;—we muſt accuſe no one of wilful falſhood:—miſrepreſentation is indeed falſhood; but there may be things

[h] In the Hiſtory of Baptiſm, quarto, London, 1790.

[i] Book III. Chap. XIV. Sect. XIV.

[k] Robinſon, page 218. 250.—Wall, 2. 3.—See alſo Bingham, 11. 4. 12.

[l] Robinſon, page 184. 193. partic. 195.—Mentioned page 219.—Wall, 1. 6. 1.

[m] Robinſon, Chap. 21.—Wall, 1. 4, 5.

[n] Robinſon, page 218.—Wall, 1. 19. 17, page 174, quarto.

[o] Robinſon, page 249.—Wall, 1 11. 1. &c.—One might compare what Wall and Robinſon ſay about Pelagius: Wall, page 210. 218.—Or what they ſay about the Council of Milevis, in 316; Wall, page 197. 220.—Robinſon, page 216.

things to make men think differently from ourſelves, of which we have no conception: this however I may be permitted to ſay; that it is totally above my comprehenſion how any honeſt candid lover of truth, could uſe the arguments which Robinſon has uſed, after reading what Wall has written. This is by no means denying Robinſon the character of an honeſt man; for many concluſions of reaſon, and dictates of wiſdom, may be above my comprehenſion.—I myſelf have a poor opinion of Robinſon's reaſoning powers; whether his underſtanding or his education may have been the cauſe, I know not; or a purſuit of eloquence; or an indignation at the proſperity of his adverſaries; or any thing elſe. I ſuppoſe his verbiage, and his quotation, will keep him from contempt; but thoſe who are able to ſee no farther than I am, if they allow him to be a man of good abilities, muſt read his great work, his elaborate Hiſtory of Baptiſm, if a love of *Truth* be uppermoſt in their minds, with diſguſt and abhorrence[p].

You may ſay, I am prejudiced; I ſhould certainly be more upon my guard againſt prejudice than I am, if I had ever had the leaſt diſlike, either to the man, or to his doctrines. I never heard the leaſt harm of the man; and, though I prefer the practice of our Church, yet I think I could live upon terms of the moſt intimate friendſhip with one, who preferred the cuſtom of delaying baptiſm to the age of maturity.

XVII. Our Hiſtory then being finiſhed, we come to *Explanation*.

"Baptiſm is not *only* a ſign of profeſſion," &c. this is affirming the ſame of Baptiſm in particular, which

[p] See the concluſion of Wall's laſt Chapter but one.

which in Art. xxv. was affirmed of Sacraments in general. Saying it is "not only" a ſign, implies that it *is* a ſign; or that there ought to be ſomething *external* in Baptiſm; contrary to the notion of the *Quakers*.

Our Church holds as "eſſential parts of Baptiſm," Water, and the form given in Matt. xxviii. 19.—See Rubric, end of Private Baptiſm, or of receiving into the Church.

"It is alſo a ſign of regeneration"—the term *regeneration* occurred in the ninth Article, and was there explained[q]. From what has been ſaid under the preſent Article, it appears to be a term borrowed, or adopted, from the Jews (if not uſed by Heathens,) denoting what we call Baptiſm: Now a name of a thing conſiſting of Parts, is often taken from one part; ſo Baptiſm denotes the whole ſacrament, though ſtrictly it be only the name of the external waſhing; and in like manner *Regeneration*, amongſt the ancients eſpecially, denotes the whole ſacrament, though ſtrictly it be only the name of the internal benefit[r], or improvement; the "ſpiritual grace;" that is the favour, or benefit accruing to the *mind* or *ſpirit*; in this life or the next; which benefit may always be aſcribed, with humble gratitude, in an indefinite manner, to God's *Holy Spirit*.—Nor is it inconſiſtent with this, to underſtand the Spirit, in the Sacrament of Baptiſm, as the *meaning*[s] of the outward ſign, and as explained by being oppoſed, or contradiſtinguiſhed to the viſible ſign—The meaning of the ſign is the

[q] Art. ix. Sect. xxiv.

[r] An inſtance of the general obſervation here made, was explained Art. iii. Sect. iii.

[s] See Dr. Balguy's laſt charge, page 302.—Alſo Art. xxv. Sect. ii.

the ſpiritual benefit annexed to it: all the expreſſions ſeem to come to the ſame thing.

"Whereby"—per quod, by which *ſign*, the promiſes of God are ſealed, &c. or, in one word, regeneration is enacted, executed, ſealed.

"As by an *inſtrument*"—I know not, that any explanation of this word inſtrument is wanted: it ſignifies means, or a deed: here it is the means of grafting and of ſigning and ſealing.

The particulars which follow, ſeem to be component parts of *regeneration:* if ſo, we have, in this Article, the notion of the Church of England, of Regeneration, given by itſelf: which, to the members of our Church, is an authentic definition. The firſt part, or ingredient, of Regeneration, is being admitted into the Society of Chriſtians, or "*grafted into the Church*," — the Catholic church.—The ſecond is, remiſſion of ſins committed before baptiſm, or afterwards, upon repentance: or a promiſe "Of the *forgiveneſs* of Sin."—The third is, *adoption* as "Sons of God, by the Holy Ghoſt."—The fourth is a confirmation of *Faith*; the fifth an increaſe of *Grace*, or of ſuch holy, pious, virtuous diſpoſitions and principles, as are moſt particularly to be aſcribed to the divine aſſiſtance.—Indeed *Faith* was ſhewn, under[t] the tenth Article, to be rightly aſcribed to God's Holy Spirit.

We might here aſk, whether John Weſley's conception of Regeneration is the ſame with that ſet forth by the Church of which he profeſſed himſelf to be a Member, the Church of England?—His Regeneration is ſubſequent to Baptiſm; which makes his Brother ſay, that with him "Baptiſm was

[t] Art. x. xxxvi.

was nothing[u]."—If it was not more than a mere "ſign of profeſſion" his idea of Baptiſm muſt be contrary to that of our Church.

Adoption "by the *Holy Ghoſt*,"—is a reference to *Scripture*.—See Rom. viii. 14. 16. but that may occur better in our Proof.

"By virtue of *prayer*"—this is *true*, but is it not making Prayer eſſential to Baptiſm? In the Reformatio Legum there is the ſame idea[x];—Verbo Dei quod intercedit, &c.—erudiuntur fideles, &c.

"*Young children*," parvulorum: this ſeems definite enough: but the age of the Infants here ſpoken of, ſeems ſtill farther defined by the Rubrics of our Office for baptizing Adults. From them it appears, that a perſon may be baptized as a child, who happens not to have been "baptized in his Infancy." Indeed this Office for Adults is comparatively modern, having been made in the year 1661, after the Reſtoration, in order that any who had been brought up Quakers or Baptiſts, might, if they pleaſed, be received into the eſtabliſhed Church: and with a view[y] to Miſſionaries: But the divines who compoſed it muſt be conſidered as very able expoſitors of the Church's meaning and intention.

"In any wiſe," rather obſolete; the Latin, however, is *Omninò*.

XVIII. "To be retained in the Church;"—that is, not given up. This expreſſion ſeems free from auſterity and preciſeneſs. A rite may be retained in a Church, even though every one be not compelled

[u] Samuel Weſley, after Mr. Hutton; ſee Weſley's Letters, page 72.—See alſo page 116. 65. 70.—Wall contends, that the word Regeneration is "never uſed by the Ancients but when they ſpeak of Baptiſm," page 354. 520.

[x] De Hæreſibus, cap. 17.

[y] See Preface to the Common Prayer-book made in 1661.—Alſo Wheatly on the Common Prayer, octavo, page 31.

pelled to uſe it. And the declaration is eaſy and liberal with regard to the particular circumſtances of Infant-baptiſm, as age, &c.—Our office for public Baptiſm of Infants ſpeaks the ſame liberal language; the Sponſors are exhorted to believe that God favourably *alloweth* Infant-baptiſm; which plainly acknowledges an imperfection in it: it is called a "*charitable* work," and ſo diſtinguiſhed from an indiſpenſible duty of a kind perfectly determinate. The next expreſſion of the Article is in the ſame ſpirit.

"As moſt agreeable with the Inſtitution of Chriſt:" there is more latitude in doing anything as ſuitable to an inſtitution, than as injoined by poſitive command: in the former caſe, you may reaſon from analogy, follow your common ſenſe, and feelings; in the latter caſe, you only obey orders; you do not think for yourſelf.

Dr. *Prieſtley* (Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2, page 93.) ſeems to think our Church not very candid; at leaſt, he repreſents it as ſaying in its public forms, "that Baptiſm is *neceſſary* for Salvation."—Perhaps the office to which he alludes, may be that for the Baptiſm of Adults; in which, the Exhortation, after the Goſpel, does ſay ſomething very like it: yet it clearly excepts extraordinary caſes, by the words, "*where it may be had*:" ſo our catechiſm; "*generally* neceſſary to Salvation."

Our Church is certainly againſt all *neglect* of Baptiſm; the exhortation to Adults conſiſts chiefly of practical ſcriptural exhortations to Baptiſm, and ſcriptural reaſons for them. It does not enter into ſpeculations.—Moreover, our Church takes no part in the queſtion about Infants dying unbaptized, (except ſo as not to *bury*: Wall, page 377,) though it pronounces (Rubric, end of Private Baptiſm) thoſe to be "undoubtedly ſaved" which

die baptized: a ſentence in which ancient Chriſtians were unanimous. In ſuch a caſe, what can hinder Salvation? The truth is, that we hold the neceſſity of Baptiſm as *Agents*, but not as *Judges*. —We think, that we do not do our part if we neglect what ſeems ordinarily a means of Salvation; and we think it the *preferable* meaſure to procure good for *children*, as far as lies in our power; in things ſpiritual as well as temporal: But we judge no one. Three heads of our Church have publiſhed this opinion.—Archbiſhop Whitgift, Archbiſhop Laud, and Archbiſhop Secker: [See Wall, 2. 6. 8, page 377.—And Secker's thirty-fifth Lecture, near the end.]

XIX. Let us now come to our *Proof*.

There ſeem to be ſeven propoſitions in our Article, and one more ſeems wanted, in order to juſtify the modern practice of partial immerſion, or *ſprinkling*, or pouring, which prevails in our Weſtern Church.

1. Baptiſm implies an *external* ceremony.

2. It is the inſtrument by which men are *graſted* into the Church of Chriſt.

3. It marks God's promiſe of *forgiveneſs* of ſins.

4. It marks God's promiſe of *adopting* us for Sons.

5. It confirms our *Faith*.

6. It increaſes *Grace*.

7. *Sprinkling*, or pouring, is not unlawful, when uſed inſtead of immerſion; (eſpecially in Infant-baptiſm.)

8. Baptizing *infants*, is to be *preferred* to leaving them unbaptized till they are able to anſwer for themſelves.

We need only undertake here to give *ſufficient* proofs, not ſuch as might be given by thoſe who made the ſubject of Baptiſm a ſeparate ſtudy.

XX. Baptiſm

XX. Baptiſm has an *external* part, or contains an external ceremony, in which *water* is uſed.

This ſeems ſufficiently clear from the word Βαπτιζω, which ſignifies to *waſh*.—We may conſult Matt. xxviii. 19.—John iv. 1.—When a perſon is ſaid to do a thing *more* than another, the thing muſt be of the ſame nature in both caſes. Now John's Baptiſm was confeſſedly by water.—The Miniſter of the Æthiopian[z] Queen waits for Baptiſm till ſome water appears.—*Cornelius's* Baptiſm depends on water; "can any man forbid water," ſays the Apoſtle, "that theſe ſhould not be[a] baptized?" —The Quaker's Baptiſm, by the Holy Ghoſt, was juſt over.—More paſſages will occur under the following propoſitions.

XXI. Baptiſm is the Inſtrument by which men are *graſted* into the Church of Chriſt.—This may appear from the texts already quoted, as they all ſhew, that the end of baptizing, was to make men *Diſciples*. Μαθητευσατε παντα εθνη, means make *Diſciples* (μαθητας)[b] of all nations; the two caſes above-mentioned are plain. We may add 1 Cor. xii. 13.—Gal. iii. 27.

It will follow from this propoſition, that all benefits which ariſe on any man's becoming a Chriſtian, may be ſpoken of as accompanying Baptiſm.

XXII. Baptiſm marks the divine promiſes of *Forgiveneſs* of Sins.—Acts ii. 38.—xiii. 38.—xxii. 16.—Eph. i. 7.—Col. i. 14.

XXIII. Baptiſm marks the divine promiſes of *adopting* us as his Sons.—Rom. viii. 14, 15, 16, 17. (here the *Holy Spirit* is mentioned.)—Gal. iii. 26, 27.—Gal. iv. 5.—Eph. i. 5.

XXIV. By

[z] Acts viii. 36. [a] Acts x. 47.

[b] See Wall, Introd. Sect. 5. and page 13, quarto, or 1. 2. 6. —Alſo page 519.—Conference, page 15. 28.

XXIV. By Baptiſm our *Faith* is confirmed.—It muſt be ſo, in the natural courſe of things. You cannot take a meaſure propoſed for your good, by thoſe who have a power of promoting it, without feeling your confidence ſtrengthened. Whatever ſeals promiſes, muſt confirm faith. Any perſon, by enliſting himſelf in the ſervice of *Chriſt*, and receiving promiſes made on his account, muſt feel a greater Faith in Chriſt.—It has been juſt now obſerved, that ſuch Faith may, on ſcriptural authority, be referred to the agency of God's *Holy Spirit*; according to Gal. v. 22.—if therefore we receive the Holy Spirit through Baptiſm, we ſtrengthen *Faith*.

XXV. By Baptiſm our *Grace* is increaſed.—This, in the language of our Church, means, good diſpoſitions and principles; as in 2 Pet. end. —It is inconceivable that good diſpoſitions ſhould not be increaſed by any worthy receiver of Baptiſm. A ſolemn act of ſelf-dedication to a religious ſociety; to a ſociety carried on under the immediate protection of Heaven itſelf; for the inſtitution of which all mankind had been in a courſe of preparation from the beginning of the world; for which the greateſt things had been done, the greateſt evils ſuffered; ſuch a ſolemn act muſt correct, regulate, meliorate, the heart and principles, if anything can. Conceive the amendment of the heart and actions to be aſcribed to the *Holy Spirit*, and then ſtudy the expreſſions of *Scripture*.—John iii. 5.—Rom. vi. 4.—1 Cor vi. 11.—Eph. iv. 22, 23, 24.—Eph. v. 26, 27.—Col. ii. 10, 11, 12.—Titus iii. 5.—Heb. x. 22.—1 Pet. iii. 21.—The proof of this propoſition ſhews, that Baptiſm is "*not only* a ſign of Profeſſion," &c. but a ſign of a ſpiritual good alſo.

The

The metaphor of *putting on*, uſed in the texts, ariſes from dreſſing after Baptiſm; it ſeems connected with the ceremony of the *white garment*[c]; nay, was probably the cauſe of that ceremony.—The metaphor of being *buried*, was probably the effect of the cuſtom of immerſion.—Men were as it were buried in the water, and roſe again to newneſs of life; or new birth.—All *renewing* is ſuppoſed to take place on the change made at Baptiſm; the idea is that of new birth, varied a little in the expreſſion. And Col. ii. 11. ſhould be remarked, as juſtifying our reaſoning by Analogy from Circumciſion to Baptiſm.—Whence we may apply Rom. ii. 28, 29.—Theſe metaphors muſt not be *confounded*; but each may be uſed. And being aware of them is a great help to underſtanding ſome paſſages of ſcripture.

We have now gone through the ſeveral parts of Baptiſm, external and internal; only two propoſitions remain, which regard the *manner* of it, and the circumſtances which ſometimes attend it.

XXVI. Though Baptiſm was at firſt adminiſtered by total immerſion, its validity is not deſtroyed, if ſafety or great convenience, requires its being adminiſtered by *affuſion*.—The *mode* of performing an *emblematical* ceremony, as was before obſerved, cannot well be a thing of the laſt importance.—The word βαπτιζω does not imply total immerſion[d] only: and if it did, we ſeem in ſuch a caſe, to be at liberty to conſult our *ſafety*, from Matt. ix. 13. and xii. 7.—or even our great convenience: it ſignifies to *waſh*: βαφη ſignifies a *ſpot*: a ſpot is partial: conceive firſt that the Jews uſed to waſh their hands by having water *poured* upon them, and then read, in the Greek, Luke xi. 38. read alſo Mark vii. 4.—Heb. ix. 10.—Beſides what

[c] Sect. IV. V. [d] Wall, page 433, quarto.

what we call baptizing, is not always expreſſed by βαπτιζω, but ſometimes by λεω, which is certainly uſed for ordinary[e] waſhing; generally of the whole body; but not always: Acts xvi. 33. could not be total immerſion:—See Eph. v. 26.—Titus iii. 5. in the *Greek*.

Archbiſhop *Secker* introduces Iſaiah lii. 15.—Ezek. xxxvi. 25. and ſome other paſſages which mention ſprinkling[f]; but the word ſprinkling in Heb. x. 22. does not ſeem to me to mean the external part of baptiſm, but the internal, metaphorically[g]; the external being expreſſed by the following words; "and our *Bodies* waſhed with pure *water*."

In general, I have felt ſome reluctance to admit the paſſages cited by Archiſhop Secker in ſupport of ſprinkling in Baptiſm. There are various ſprinklings enjoined in the Law of Moſes, as thoſe with aſhes, water, oil, blood; and with ſome mixtures, ſuch as aſhes and water; blood and hyſſop, &c.—and ſome of theſe are alluded to in the New Teſtament; but I feel unwilling to apply to the external part of Baptiſm any alluſions to the ſprinkling of *Blood*; they ſeem more applicable either to purifying the *Heart*, or to the death of Chriſt, and the Doctrine of Atonement. If there were, in the *New* Teſtament, alluſions to the ſprinklings with *water*, I ſhould be willing to adopt them; and I think

[e] Properly, νιπτω ſignifies to waſh *hands*; (ſometimes to waſh feet) :—πλυνω—to waſh *cloaths*; λεω—to waſh the whole body. —Βαπτω does not, I fancy, make one feel, ſo ſtrongly as the others, the idea of aiming at cleanneſs; only as cleanneſs comes of *courſe* from immerſion: but it ſeems applicable to a greater number of things than the others.

[f] 35th Lecture on Catechiſm, page 226.

[g] The ſprinkling correſponds to thoſe ſprinklings which were intended to *purify*, (ſee Lev. viii. 15.—Heb. ix. 18–22). theſe were made with *blood*.

think the Prophecies, Iſ. lii. 15. and Ezek. xxxvi. 25. may be applicable; but I do not recollect any alluſions to ſprinklings with water: Heb. x. 22. may ſeem to be one, as blood is not mentioned; but of that I have ſpoken.—Nevertheleſs there certainly are, in the *old* Teſtament emblematical purifications by water, both in the way of bathing and ſprinkling[h]; and as that is the caſe, there ſeems ſome degree of ſcriptural authority for our uſing both methods in our ſacramental cleanſings: the caſe is ſuch as to admit of all kinds of arguments and authorities: eſpecially as it is not eaſy to underſtand how ſome baptiſms mentioned in the New Teſtament, could be performed by total immerſion[i].

XXVII. Baptizing *Infants* is *preferable* to leaving them unbaptized till they are of age to anſwer for themſelves.

1. This ſeems to follow from reaſon, and from the principles of natural law[k] already mentioned: if an Infant was enabled to judge for himſelf, a Chriſtian, (and it is of Chriſtians we ſpeak), muſt conclude, that he would chuſe to be admitted into Chriſtianity.—One good effect of Infant-baptiſm is, that it precludes the painful queſtion, 'when ſhall I be baptized?' and prevents that procraſtination which Gregory of Nazianzum laboured ſo much to prevent. One may conceive a young perſon to *delay* baptiſm, ſometimes through fear and ſcruple, ſometimes deferring it to a "convenient ſeaſon" with a view of enjoying an illicit gratification a little

[h] Numb. xix. 19—21. and "diverſe waſhings," Heb. ix. 10. (διαφοροις βαπτισμοις,) ſeem to include both ſorts: will not our βαπτισμα therefore allow of both ſorts, bathing and ſprinkling?

[i] Secker's Lect. 35, page 227.

[k] Sect. xi. beginning.

little and a little longer.—And why ſhould not infants enjoy the benefits of Chriſtian ſociety, as well as worldly rank and property? Thoſe who refuſe them the privilege, mean well; but they act like a formal and preciſe, though well-meaning ſervant, who would ſtand ſtill and be uſeleſs, though much wanted, rather than do any thing which his Maſter had not *ordered* him to do.

2. The Religion of *Moſes* obviates the great objection to our plan, which is, that an Infant cannot enter into a Covenant. Whereas circumciſion admitted children into the Old Covenant by Divine Appointment[l].

3. The practice of the firſt teachers of Chriſtianity ſeems to me, upon the whole, to be much in favour of Infant-baptiſm. I ſhould imagine with the learned Lightfoot[m], that as the Jews uſually baptized the children of Proſelytes, they would, when they went out to be baptized by *John*, take their young children to be baptized with them. This is not mentioned, but the baptiſm of children ſeems to be taken for *granted* in ſcripture, as are moral[n] duties of the greateſt importance.—When we have not words to judge by, we muſt judge by actions or cuſtoms. As the children of converts to Judaiſm were always baptized, the order to convert and baptize all nations, would, of courſe, be underſtood[o] to include children.—Suppoſe the order had been, 'go ye and *circumciſe* all nations;'—would not the circumciſion of children have been included?—If one of our *Baptiſt* congregations was to ſend out a Miniſter, with the commiſſion,

[l] Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12. with Gen. xvii. 12, 13. and Lev. xii. 3.

[m] Horæ Hebr. on Matt. iii.—See Wall's Introd page lvi.

[n] Dr. Balguy, page 87, beginning of 6th Diſcourſe.

[o] Wall's Introd. page xlviii. and lvi.—Conference, page 28, 29.

commiſſion, 'Go and baptize the Indians or Gentoos,' I ſhould think he groſsly perverted his commiſſion if he baptized children. But if one was ſent from the Church of *England* with the ſame commiſſion, 'Go and baptize the Gentoos,' I ſhould think he groſsly neglected his commiſſion if he did *not* baptize children. When a cuſtom was once ſettled, which the ſollicitude of parents would ſtrongly impel them to continue, not to check ſuch a cuſtom was, in a manner, to encourage it, and give it a ſanction.—And ſuch a cuſtom prevailing, it is difficult to conceive that *Houſeholds* would be baptized, and the children omitted.

4. Beſides the practice of the firſt publiſhers of Chriſtianity, thus gathered, there is a particular paſſage, or perhaps two, of the New Teſtament worth conſidering.

1 Cor. vii. 14. ſhews, that if *either* parent of a child was a Chriſtian, the child might be brought up a Chriſtian, and called *holy*, or of the peculiar[p] people of God: Chriſtians have often in Scripture the name of *Saints*, or *Sancti*. Now Wall contends, that holy, ἅγιος, means, or implies *baptized*; and this he ſeems to ſupport[q] with great force of argument.

Mr.

[p] Locke on the place.

[q] Wall, quarto, page 67. 99. 175.—Conference, page 40, &c.—46, &c.—The idea ſeems to be this:—'I (Paul) am now giving you prudential advice of my *own* (ver. 12.);—do not leave your huſband (or wife) becauſe he is an Heathen; for the *fact* is, it hath often happened, that the Chriſtian wife hath converted her Heathen huſband, ſo that the man hath been baptized (ἡγιασται), or *ſanctified* (a word often uſed for Baptized) through his wife; and vice versâ.—Beſides, if you leave your huſband, what will become of your *children?* live together, and though he continue a Heathen, you may prevail upon him to let your children be brought up Chriſtians: (or made *ſaints*, ſancti).' Now no one, ſays Wall, is called *Saint*, or

Mr. Locke's expreſſion is as if the child muſt be a Chriſtian[r] if born of Chriſtian parents; but he only takes the Baptiſm for *granted:* he only compares Chriſtians with Jews; (ſee his Note) and though a child might, in ſome ſenſe, be ſaid to be a Jew born, all things being ſuppoſed to go on regularly in their ordinary courſe; yet circumciſion, was, in ſtrictneſs, neceſſary to make a Jew; and ſo Baptiſm, to make a Chriſtian. As Mr. Locke took the Baptiſm for granted, ſo might St. Paul.

I will only farther mention, Mark x. 14. or the the four verſes which make the *Goſpel* in our office for the Baptiſm of Infants.—"They brought young children to Chriſt"—perhaps an Antipædobaptiſt would ſay, why did he not baptize them? Becauſe their parents did not bring them for that purpoſe; the parents were not yet Chriſtians; Jeſus was not a profeſſed *Baptiſt*; perhaps his Diſciples might afterwards baptize ſome of theſe. Whatever argument this ſcripture may be for the Baptiſm of Infants, it ſhews plainly how eager parents were, at the time, to gain every ſpiritual benefit for their young children. They deſired that their children might be[s] *touched* by an Holy Man; not thinking he would take them up in his arms.—

From

or holy, who was not *baptized*—How can we conceive that a child, whoſe Father was an Heathen, and mother a Chriſtian, could be made a Chriſtian any *other* way but by being baptized?—Gal. iii. 27.—Auguſtin ſays, (ſee Wall, page 175.) that whatever is meant by the text, no one can be made a Chriſtian without the *Sacraments*.

[r] This may be the ground of the Socinian notion: ſee Sect. ix. but if our reaſoning here is juſt, that notion is not to be admitted; it is to be conſidered as unſcriptural, if not dangerous: and as probably ariſing from prejudice againſt the doctrine of the Trinity.

[s] Compare touching for the King's evil.—Woman touching the hem of Chriſt's garment.

It appears from the accounts of the other Evangeliſts, that Chriſt took a child in his arms as an *emblem* of innocence, in order to teach his Diſciples how ſimple and free from guile they ought to be; children in *malice*[t], though men in underſtanding: but St. Mark's account gives more idea of our Saviour's attending to the children *themſelves*: why might not our Lord *both* feel a kind concern for the children, and take occaſion from them to inculcate godly ſincerity and ſimplicity? if his feelings were lively, his moral would be ſtrong.—He admitted them to no *covenant*, but he *bleſſed* them affectionately; holding them in his arms: his benediction, ſurely, muſt be ſome *ſpiritual* good.—My reaſon dare ſcarcely make an argument from this intereſting ſcene; but, when I contemplate it, I always wiſh myſelf a painter, that I might give a laſting repreſentation of it. What an attitude might not that of Jeſus be! what a countenance! looking down, with a mild and gracious benevolence, on the Infant in his Arms! expreſſing a deep knowledge of what was in man! other children of different ages and characters, grouped in various employments; the officious Diſciples, with ill-grounded apprehenſions, and needleſs importance, endeavouring to diſperſe them; the mother of the child in our Saviour's arms, near him, expreſſing, as one principal figure, in her face and geſture, ſuſpenſe and hope, not without ſome degree of fear; joy, refined and meliorated with parental affection and piety: other parents; ſome mildly triumphing in the benediction already received, others gently preſſing forward to attain it. —Though reaſon may ſcruple to draw an argument from this ſcene, yet who that performs the

[t] 1 Cor. xiv. 20.

the ceremony of Baptiſm, does not feel its efficacy? the Infant in one's arms excites a ſentiment of tenderneſs; the Goſpel has been juſt read; the ceremony becomes, to the Imagination, an Imitation of the [u] benevolence of him who appointed it: and then this Scripture pleads to the *heart*, more forcibly than any coarſe audible eloquence; it even convinces more intimately than the logic of any preciſe reaſoners, who, by too great ſtiffneſs in adhering to what is minutely right, are often found ſubſtantially in the wrong.

XXVIII. We here cloſe our direct proof: let us ſee whether any *objections* occur, of weight enough to induce us to dwell upon them.

Objections may come from *Quakers* (ancient or modern), or from *Baptiſts*.

With regard to *Water-baptiſm*, we have only ſuch objections as are made by thoſe whom I call ancient Quakers, the Aſcodrutæ, &c. and by the Quakers of modern times.

The ancient Heretics would have our religion to be intirely *ſpiritual*; but can we throw off our earthly tabernacle in this life? are not our minds affected by means of our ſenſes? are not the generality of men affected chiefly by their means? nay, amongſt thoſe who reflect, are not ideas of reflexion allowed to have their firſt origin in ſenſation [x]?—And can Chriſtians ſet aſide matter, one of whoſe peculiar articles of Faith, is, the Reſurrection of the Body?

XXIX The modern Quakers produce paſſages of Scripture in ſupport of their ſpiritual notions; but without a ſound interpretation: when they have ſeemed to follow Scripture, it has been becauſe

[u] "This *charitable* work of ours."

[x] Locke on the Human Underſtanding.—Book 2. Chap. 6. and Chap. 1. Sect. 3. 24.

becauſe they took it in a *literal* ſenſe; which is apt to ſtrike the *people*, though often groſsly wrong; ſo wrong as to be univerſally thought ſo, in a little time. Wall, apologizing[y] for Irenæus's book againſt early Hereſies, and for writers who were obliged to confute "ſuch idle and enthuſiaſtic ſtuff as ſeems to us not to deſerve three words;" adds, "So any book written now in anſwer to the reaſonings of the *Quakers*, &c. will, in the next age, ſeem to be the work of a man that had little to do[z]." Such books however have been written, by *Bennet* and Charles *Leſlie*: and to them I will refer you: contenting myſelf with a ſhort ſpecimen. St. Paul, exhorting to unity, ſays[a], "there is one Lord, one Faith, *one Baptiſm*:" how then, ſays *Barclay*, can there be *two* Baptiſms?—one by water, another ſpiritual?—This argument is not mentioned by Barclay in paſſing, but it is inſiſted on[b]: yet to ſay, there is only one Baptiſm, therefore it has no water; ſeems the ſame thing as to ſay, one thing is never compoſed of *Parts*; the King of England is but one *man*, therefore he has no *Body*, or he has no *Soul*. That is but one *tree*, therefore it has no *root*, or it has no *branches*.

Several

[y] Page 43, quarto.

[z] I would not be thought ſo far to adopt the obſervation of Wall as to ſay, that any one may at firſt ſight, perceive the fallacy of *all* the arguments of the Quakers; they have by ſome been thought perplexing, even when not convincing.—Mr. E. told me once, coming from one of my Lectures, that he had been in more danger from Barclay's Apology, than from any Book written againſt our Religion.—And Rev. John Norris, of Bemerton near Saliſbury, who died in 1711, ſaid, "that he would rather encounter ten Cardinal Bellarmines, than one David Barclay."—So the Newſpaper ſays; but without referring to the part of Mr. Norris's works where the ſaying is to be found.

[a] Eph. iv. 5.

[b] Barclay's Apology, Prop. 12. Sect. 3.

Several arguments of the Quakers turning upon *one form* of expreſſion, it may be mentioned;—I mean the ſcriptural negative form of *compariſon:* ſuch as we find 1 Cor. i. 17. and 1 Pet. iii. 21.—"Chriſt ſent me *not* to baptize, *but* to preach the Goſpel Baptiſm"—"*not* the putting away of the filth of the fleſh, *but* the anſwer of a good conſcience," &c.—But there are a multitude of ſuch compariſons; ſee Matt. ix. 13. and Col. iii. 2.—One might add, Matt. vi. 19, 20. and xxv. 33. and 1 Tim. ii. 9, 10. according to Fordyce.—And, according to Archbiſhop Sharp, Matt. xii. 31[c].—Who will make all theſe to be abſolute negatives?—if not all, why the two firſt?

xxx. But, to drop the enemies to Water-baptiſm, as our Church holds[d] it eſſential to Baptiſm, that a perſon be baptized "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt," it may be proper to mention an objection of the *Baptiſts*; that, in the Acts of the Apoſtles, converts are ſometimes[e] ſaid to be baptized in the name, or *into* the *name of Chriſt*, or of *the Lord*.—But this ſeems to mean only admiſſion into *Chriſtianity*, by Baptiſm; it might be, in the uſual form. Baptiſm in the name of *Chriſt*, ſeems contradiſtinguiſhed to the Baptiſm of *John*; or of the *Jews*; or to Heatheniſm: ſuch an expreſſion would not preclude the farther inquiry, by what *Form* was ſuch a perſon baptized into the name of Chriſt? probably, by the uſual form[f]. For the expreſſion, the

[c] Art. XVI. Sect. IV.

[d] Rubric to private Baptiſm, at the end; already mentioned, Sect. XVII.

[e] See Acts ii. 38.—viii. 16.—x. 48.—xix. 5.—P. S. See Wall, page 435, quarto.

[f] This may be right reaſoning, though ſome ancient Chriſtians did ſometimes baptize in the name of *Chriſt* inſtead of baptizing in the form preſcribed, Matt. xxviii. 19. they might miſunderſtand

the *name* of Chriſt, we ſhould read Acts iv. 12. which was introduced into our eighteenth Article. —There is no other *name* under Heaven whereby men may be ſaved, but that of Chriſt; the names of *Moloch*, Remphan, &c. are inſufficient and impotent.—When we were accuſtomed to this language, being baptized into the *name* of Chriſt, would only convey the idea of *becoming* Chriſtians, without implying any particular form[g].

With regard to *Infant-baptiſm*, ſeveral objections have already occurred: I will therefore now mention only two.

XXXI. If infants are to receive one ſacrament, why not *both?*—it uſed to be a cuſtom, for many centuries, to give Infants the Lord's ſupper; nay, it is now with the Greeks, and with "near half the Chriſtians in the world[h]."—But to make them *Members* of Chriſt, was more neceſſary on account of original ſin, than to make them go through a ceremony in *commemoration* of his death.—Thoſe who receive the Lord's Supper, renew their baptiſmal vow, broken by actual ſin; but Infants have committed none, and it may be doubted whether, regularly,

miſunderſtand Acts xix. 5.—See Art. 1. Sect. XVIII. Vol. 2. page 273.

[g] Gal. iii. 27. "For as many of you as have been baptized *into* Chriſt, have put on Chriſt."

Acts xix. 2.—Some perſons at Epheſus told St. Paul, that they had not heard of the *Holy Ghoſt*; he immediately aſked, "unto what were ye then *baptized?*" does not this ſeem to imply, that if they had been baptized as Chriſtians, they muſt have heard of the Holy Ghoſt? that is, they muſt have been baptized according to Matt. xxviii. 19.

[h] Wall, page 517, 4to. or 2. 9. 17. He adds, that probably the Weſtern Church would have continued the practice, had it not been for the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation: this may be juſt, though Sir Edwin Sandys ſays, that the Greeks hold Tranſubſtantiation.—Speculum Europæ, page 233.—But ſee farther Art. XXX. Sect. III.

regularly, *Confirmation* ſhould not precede a partaking of the Lord's Supper. We have reaſoned from the Jewiſh to the Chriſtian law: amongſt the Jews, children were initiated by circumciſion, but did not partake of the Paſchal ſupper, which is analogous to the Lord's ſupper with us; ſo at leaſt it is ſuppoſed[i].—Infants cannot receive in remembrance of Chriſt.—But if any church is, at laſt, of opinion, that Infants ought to have the Lord's Supper; let ſuch give it them: our reaſoning in favour of Infant-baptiſm remains unaffected.

XXXII. Baptiſm conſiſts of two parts, external and internal; perſons baptized are accordingly ſaid to be born again of water and the ſpirit[k].—Children may be born of water, but how of the *Spirit?* how can their Faith be confirmed, or their grace increaſed? It does not ſeem neceſſary that all the benefits of Baptiſm ſhould belong to every perſon baptized; it is enough if the Sacrament has both an external and an internal part. An infant cannot have faith[l], or good principles; but it may be "*grafted* into the Church" and *adopted*; and it may even have *forgiveneſs*, though not of actual ſin; it may have remiſſion of the penalties inflicted on the human[m] race. Our Saviour was baptized; but he who knew no ſin, of any kind, could have no forgiveneſs. He who was, from the firſt the Son of God, could not receive *adoption*.

XXXIII. Here

[i] Exod. xii. 26. does not prove this:—Bingham quotes it, 15. 4. 7. end, and gives ſome reaſons.——Wall, at the end of Chap. 9. (Part 2.) mentions the Paſſover twice; as underſtood not to be for children: but quotes no text.

[k] John iii. 5.

[l] The Lutherans allow them Faith; and the Pelagians uſed to aſcribe to them actual Sin, in order to avoid original.

[m] This may ſeem leſs ſtrange or harſh to thoſe who have conſidered what was ſaid under the ninth Article.

XXXIII. Here we put an end to our Proof, direct and indirect; and therefore proceed to our *Application*. I have been in doubt whether a new Form of Aſſent is wanted, and have tried one; but on the whole, I do not think it worth while to detain you by giving it here.—We come therefore to mutual *conceſſions*.

XXXIV. Here, again, we have to deal with *Quakers* and *Baptiſts*.

Conceſſions to Quakers, of the ancient or modern ſort, we have none to make.—Nor to the Socinians: ſome Baptiſm we think clearly appointed in the ſcriptures; but, at the ſame time we diſclaim all judging of our Brother; "to his own[n] Maſter he ſtandeth or falleth."

XXXV. As to *Baptiſts*, they differ from us, both with regard to *ſprinkling*, and to baptizing *Infants*. But if they agree with us in other things, there ſeems nothing in theſe, which need hinder us from uniting.—At ſome[o] times the Baptiſts have profeſſed to think, on moſt ſubjects, with the Church of England: but ſects are apt to veer about "with every wind of Doctrine[p]" (preventing which, is one great good of an eſtabliſhed church):—the Socinians are now labouring to unite[q] all ſects of Diſſenters againſt our National Church: an union which could anſwer no *religious* purpoſe. It is indeed ridiculous to think of the Baptiſts and Socinians favouring each other, merely becauſe they both oppoſe Infant-Baptiſm, when they do it from principles ſo different, that they ſhould rather diſpute than unite; one holding Baptiſm to be

[n] Secker's Lectures, Lect. 35. near the end.—Rom. xiv. 4.
[o] Wall, page 551. [p] Eph. iv. 14.
[q] See Dr. Prieſtley's Addreſs to the Methodiſts, prefixed to Weſley's Letters.

be neceſſary, the other to be unneceſſary.—But as to immerſion and ſprinkling, a Baptiſt need not quit the Church of England; becauſe according to our Rubrics, I do not ſee how a Prieſt could refuſe immerſion if it were required. Our Fonts have indeed grown leſs and leſs ſuited to dipping, but that ſurely is not to be mentioned in arguing about Doctrines.

Nay our baptizing *Infants* does not ſeem to lay the Baptiſt under an abſolute neceſſity of ſeparating from us. Suppoſe a Baptiſt was to try the experiment: would he be compelled to bring his *children* to Baptiſm[r]? does not our Church provide for baptizing at any age?—But if a Baptiſt was called upon to ſubſcribe to our XXXIX Articles, could he ſubſcribe to our preſent Article?—to every part of it, except the laſt clauſe, Baptiſts *have*[s] ſubſcribed.—But the clauſe, "the Baptiſm of young children is to be retained in the Church;"—could he ſubſcribe to that?—if he could not, it might be altered; 'the Baptiſm of young children is to be *permitted* to thoſe who prefer it,' would do as well for our church.—But ſome might be contented with this ſenſe; 'I deſire and wiſh that the Baptiſm of young children may be "*retained in the church*," and I think it ought to be, in order that thoſe who think it their duty to bring their children to Baptiſm, may not be deprived of an opportunity:' but on the other hand, 'as I think it right to afford my Chriſtian brethren, who differ from me, an opportunity of baptizing in their own

[r] I do not ſee that he would, by the *Canons*.—Burn mentions an Act of 3 Jac. ordering the children of *Popiſh* Recuſants to be baptized within a month.

[s] Wall, page 551.

own way, I hope they will grant me the ſame Liberty.'

Limborch is of opinion, probably after *Grotius*, that all Chriſtians might, conſiſtently with the Scriptures, follow their own notions with regard to the manner and circumſtances of Baptiſm; including in theſe, the age of the perſon baptized[t]. —But he thinks, of courſe, that Infant-baptiſm ought to be deemed *valid*, and therefore he blames the Anabaptiſts for re-baptizing. And he thinks infant-baptiſm valid, not only becauſe every one ſhould have liberty, in ſuch a caſe, to act as he pleaſes; but becauſe it is agreeable to the *Genius* of the Doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt.—An expreſſion not unlike the concluding one of our Article[u].

Dr. Prieſtley[x] concludes his Hiſtory of Baptiſm with giving his opinion, that thoſe who are called *rational Diſſenters* baptize children more from the influence of ſettled *cuſtom*, and through a deſire of avoiding all diſturbance, than from any fixed perſuaſion that they are under an obligation to baptize them.

Even Mr. *Tombs*[y], the beſt, as well as the moſt candid, of the Baptiſt-writers, who continued an Antipædobaptiſt all his Life, wrote againſt ſeparation from the Church, and "continued in communion with the Church, till he died."

What

[t] Limborch, Theol. Chriſt. 5. 68. 25.—Wall ſomewhere ſays, that Grotius was the firſt who repreſented it as a matter of *indifference* whether a man was baptized in infancy, or his Baptiſm delayed.—He blames Grotius as diſingenuous.

[u] Limborch, Theol. 5. 69. 9.—"Doctrinæ Jeſu Chriſti genio optimè convenire."

[x] Hiſt. Corr. 2. page 94. There is afterwards an *Appendix*, to both Sacraments.

[y] Wall, page 454.—Alſo 429, 430. 528.—See alſo 2. 2. 15.

What greater encouragements to Unity can be had?

XXXVI. I have frequently finiſhed my Application with ſome hints of *Improvement*; but none occur to me at preſent, except ſuch as the preceding remarks cannot fail to ſuggeſt.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXVIII.

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Supper of the Lord is not only a ſign of the love that Chriſtians ought to have among themſelves one to another; but rather is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Chriſt's death: inſomuch that to ſuch as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the ſame, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Chriſt, and likewiſe the Cup of bleſſing is a partaking of the Blood of Chriſt.

Tranſubſtantiation, (or the change of the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occaſion to many ſuperſtitions.

The Body of Chriſt is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and ſpiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Chriſt is received and eaten in the ſupper, is faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Chriſt's ordinance reſerved, carried about, lifted up, or worſhipped.

---

1. The *Hiſtory* of this Article might be made very extenſive; but I will endeavour to confine myſelf to ſuch incidents as ſeem likely to be moſt uſeful.—As all incidents are built upon the ſcriptural

tural account of the Inſtitution of the Lord's Supper, it will be proper to give that, before we proceed; in full, or in ſubſtance. All the paſſages of Scripture which mention it, might be ſoon read; but that account which is contained in our Prayer of Conſecration, and makes a kind of *harmony*, ſeems ſufficient.—" In the ſame night that he was betrayed," &c.—The things principally to be noticed are the metaphorical expreſſions: But we ſhould not ſuffer ourſelves to be hindered by the familiarity and commonneſs of the ſounds, from obſerving, how ſtrange a thing it is to be commanded to eat the fleſh of our teacher and Lord[a]; and how much more ſtrange to be commanded to drink his Blood; though it were only in an emblematical way: eſpecially conſidering, that the perſons who firſt received the command, were Jews, to whom taſting blood was prohibited.—This ſtrangeneſs will naturally make us go back to the Old Teſtament in order to ſee the nature of the Jewiſh Sacrifices, to which alluſion is made: *ſin-offerings*[b], *peace-offerings*, *Paſſover*.

The *ſin-offering*; *blood*, *ſhed*, *ſprinkled*, called the blood of the *Covenant*.—Loaf *broken*, part *given* to God (or his Prieſt); Animal *broken*, or divided into pieces.—The *Peace-offering*; for benefits paſt, or future; " in remembrance" of Mercies.—Animal partly *given*, partly made into a *feaſt*, eaten with

[a] This command does appear (take, *eat*, this is *my Body*) independently of John vi.—though when I read that Chapter as *prophetical*, and conſider what Biſhop *Cleaver* ſays of the Analogy between John iii. and John vi. I am of opinion it does relate to the Euchariſt.—It is not ſo plain as a narration; and it contains obſcure intimations in the way of reproof, like John iii. but I feel ſatisfied with that Interpretation, which refers it to the Sacrament.

[b] Theſe were mentioned, Append. to Art. XI. Sect. II. and XXVII.

with friends. *Drink-offering*, implying *Cup*.—The *Paſſover*—a *Lamb* ſlain, eaten "in *remembrance*" of *redemption*. He who reads theſe things will be aware alſo (Hammond on Matt. xxvi. 26.) of the Jewiſh cuſtom of *breaking* and diſtributing *Bread*, as an act of *kindneſs*, and of putting round a *Grace-cup*, or cup of *bleſſing* or Salvation: And will know, that the Heathens had *ſacrifices* and *feaſts* upon them, with *libations*, or *cups* of bleſſing.—(Cup of *Salvation*, Pſalm cxvi. 13.): theſe things conſidered, we ſhall perceive, that our Saviour's commands would appear natural and *intelligible* to Jews; unleſs they ſhould think, that, in the new Inſtitution, the different ſort of ſacrifices were oddly mixed and confounded together.

11. No ſuch notion, nor any other, hindered the inſtitution from being univerſally adopted by Chriſtian converts. They might ſee, that the Death of Chriſt, taken as a ſacrifice, reſembled, in different points, *different* ſorts of offerings; and therefore, that they *all* had *prefigured* his Death.—(Appendix to Art. xi. Sect. xxvii.) At firſt the ordinance was probably *ſimple*; but afterwards it became more varied and complex; as well as more animated, or *paſſionate*; and more *adorned* and magnificent. – When perſons had great dangers to encounter in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity, it naturally heated their imagination and paſſions; and led them to do every thing with earneſtneſs and fervour[c].

The idea of the *Aſcodrutæ*, and others of the ſame turn, would have place here[d], as well as in Baptiſm.

We

[c] This was ſaid of Sacraments in general, but the remark is wanted here.

[d] Art. xxv. ii. and xxvii. viii.

We meet with the expreſſions, *Miſſa Catechumenorum*, and *Miſſa*[e] *Fidelium*, to denote certain parts of divine ſervice, in ancient times.—The *fideles* were mature, complete Chriſtians, who ſtaid in the place of worſhip, and received the Communion, after the Catechumens were *diſmiſſed*[f].—I do not think, that our knowledge is perfectly clear about all the particulars of theſe matters; but it is probable, that Miſſa Catechumenorum meant the ſervice before the Communion, and Miſſa Fidelium, the Communion-Service: and that the word *Maſs*, with its connexions, *miſſal*, &c. had this origin; (Meſſa, Meſſe): *Maſs* continued to be the name for the Lord's Supper[g] in England during part of the reign of Edward VI. but was probably odious.

III. Whoever came to the Communion (and all the *faithful*, except penitents, communicated at firſt) brought ſome *offerings*, proportioned to their reſpective fortunes; chiefly of *bread* and *wine*; out of theſe the Prieſts took as much as it was neceſſary to *conſecrate*. The bread was common leavened bread, ſuch as was ordinarily uſed. The Romiſh *Wafers*, which are unleavened, and very thin, and round, like a coin, and ſo ſmall that each perſon can take an whole one in his mouth without danger of letting any of it drop, did not come into uſe till the eleventh or twelfth Century.—Some choſe to uſe unleavened bread, as what had been uſed at the Jewiſh *Paſſover*, the type of the Lord's Supper; and that occaſioned a long diſpute between the Greeks and the learned of the Weſtern Church[h]. Attempts were made at different

[e] Bingham, Book 15.—Wheatly, page 328.

[f] Catechumens are called, in our Homily, "*Learners* in Religion," page 356, 8vo. Hom. 27th on the Sacrament.

[g] And the Augſburg Confeſſion (ſaid to be like ours) will not allow, that it aboliſhes the *Maſs*.—Syntagma, page 30.

[h] In the 11th Cent.—Prieſtley's Hiſt. Corr. 2. page 56.

ferent times, to introduce *water* inſtead of wine, and water *mixed* with wine; and *milk*, and *honey*: *Grapes* alſo, and even *Cheeſe*, had their Advocates. —Thoſe who avoided wine were called *Encratitæ*, as avoiding it on principles of abſtemiouſneſs: if they were for pure water, they were called *Aquarians*; and thoſe who uſed bread and cheeſe, were called αρτοτυριται.

Mixing ſome water with the wine, ſeems to have been a prevailing cuſtom amongſt rational Chriſtians for a great length of time; it aroſe from a notion, that the *Jews* uſed to mix water with their paſchal cup, on account of their wine being ſtrong; and it deſcended even to the time after our Reformation in England.—See Wheatly on the Common Prayer, page 289. 292.

IV. In the earlier part of the *Ceremony*, it was thought a proper thing (as in Baptiſm) to follow the advice of the Apoſtle literally, "ſalute one another[i] with an holy kiſs;" but the different ſexes did not ſalute each other.

The ancient Chriſtians roſe gradually in their devotion, till they came to the moſt ſolemn and animated giving of *thanks*: that was called Ευχαριστια, and thence the ſolemnity got its[k] name of *Euchariſt*. In this part was the *Triſagium*, a ſhort Hymn ſo called from its having the word ἁγιος, Holy, repeated thrice: it was much the ſame with ours, "Therefore with Angels," &c[l].

V. *After* the communion, part of the conſecrated elements, was ſometimes *preſerved* in the Church, for ſuch as had not been able to attend: and

[i] Rom. xvi. 16 and parallel places.

[k] See Wheatly's account, page 302.—Bingham, Book 15.

[l] For the Greeks ſee Cave's ſecond Appendix. They ſeem to have been quite enthuſiaſts about this Hymn. *Allix* has written an Hiſtory of it.

and part was ſometimes allowed to be carried to the Houſes of the *ſick*; but this laſt cuſtom got abuſed, and was left off: *children* had a part: and ſometimes a part was *burnt*; (Lev. viii. 32.)

A good deal, I ſuppoſe, of the offerings remained unconſecrated. The Prieſts had a portion of them, and the reſt furniſhed the repaſt called Αγαπη, or *Love-feaſt*; an entertainment[m] originally of a truly Chriſtian ſort, at which the rich and poor met together. Pity that any *ſcandal* ſhould ever occaſion its being left off!

Theſe things, or moſt of them, may be found in Bingham's Antiquities. He mentions ſuch a thing as a *Family*-Communion[n].

VI. For many *hundred* years after the publication of the Chriſtian Religion, though *we* now find it the more rational the more we conſider it, Reaſon was on the decline. Paſſion had, on that account, the freer ſcope; and religious paſſion, when not regulated by reaſon, becomes ſuperſtition, myſticiſm, enthuſiaſm. In the dark ages, men ran into all theſe.—Though no form of ſpeech is more natural than *Metaphor* when an emblematical rite is intended to expreſs a fact of great importance, yet nothing is more obvious to fanaticiſm, than to ſeize upon a metaphorical expreſſion, in things grand and awful, and raiſe its ſenſe to every height that it will bear; indeed the moſt extravagant ſenſe of a metaphorical expreſſion may be its *literal* ſenſe. Thus we may conceive that, when high

[m] See Lardner's account of Pliny's Ep. to Trajan; where he mentions *Hallett* as treating on the ſubject.—Lardner's Works, Vol. 7. page 311.—See alſo Lardner, Vol. 8. page 71.—Lucian's account of Peregrinus, and the Chriſtians having a good ſupper together; and being brethren.

[n] Bingham, 15. 4. 3.

high and lofty things had been ſaid, for a long[o] time, in a declamatory way, of the neceſſity of eating the *fleſh* and drinking the *blood* of Chriſt, and men kept trying to ſurpaſs each other in flights of devotion, they might at laſt come to profeſs, as a *Doctrine*, that the conſecrated bread and wine were *really*, without a figure, turned into the body and blood of Jeſus Chriſt! — This Doctrine is uſually called the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*; becauſe thoſe who hold it, ſay that, on the conſecration, the bread and wine loſe their own *ſubſtance*, and are changed or tranſmuted into the ſubſtance of the Body of Chriſt.—Yet as the bread and wine *appear* to be ſtill the ſame, this Hypotheſis is helped out by another; that though the *ſubſtance* be changed, the *accidents* remain unchanged; accidents are *hardneſs*, colour, and in ſhort all the qualities by which we know one ſubſtance from another.—The diſcovery of this doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, is aſcribed to one *Paſchaiſe*, in Latin *Radbertus Paſchaſius*[p], a French Monk, who had afterwards the magnificent German Abbey of Corbey, with the Sovereignty annexed. But the term,

[o] *Chryſoſtom* is ſaid to have written and ſpoken ſome very declamatory expreſſions on this ſubject: as, that the *Lips* were *tinged* with the *blood* of our Lord, &c. but Collier, (Eccles. Hiſt. Vol. 2. page 369, or near it,) diſtinguiſhes between the *Oratorical* works of Chryſoſtom and his reaſoning works. Of the reaſoning ſort is the Letter to *Cæſarius*, which the Papiſts are unwilling to allow genuine.—By the way, Collier takes the *tinging*, &c. in an higher ſenſe than I do: when we *drink* the blood of Chriſt, our lips muſt be *tinged* with it: it is only fixing the *attention* on the *ſame* metaphor.

[p] Cave, Hiſt. Lit. Paſchaſius, or Vol. 2, page 2. opening of the 9th Century: that it was not known during the Neſtorian and Eutychian Controverſies, appears from a paſſage quoted by Biſhop Pearſon; on Creed, page 328. 1ſt Edit. or page 162, fol. —from Gelaſius (Biſhop of Rome in 490) de duabus Naturis Chriſti.

term, or *name*, was not given till the thirteenth Century; and in the ſame Century the Doctrine firſt received the ſupport and authority of a *Council*[q]. *Lanfranc* (Archbiſhop of Canterbury at laſt) was the perſon who firſt brought the Doctrine into *England*; about the middle of the eleventh Century.—(See Fox's Mart. Vol. 2, page 457.)—Strange as this Doctrine ſeems, it has been found to ſeize and affect the mind, ſo that even improved nations have been unwilling to give it up: a crucified *Deity* preſent to the *ſenſes!* not through Incarnation, but *Impanation!* what an idea! enough to fill the mind with ſacred horror, (no *doubt* intervening) and to make every ordinary ſentiment appear inſipid!

VII. It muſt not be concluded, from what has been ſaid, that all thoſe who profeſſed what is commonly called the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, explained the particulars exactly in the ſame way: where there was ſo much room for ſuppoſition, it would have been a wonder if ſeveral hypotheſes had not appeared; they may, however, all come under the general notion of *corporal preſence*[r]. And ſo may the hypotheſis of *Conſubſtantiation*, of which by and by.

VIII. *Oppoſition* was ſoon made to the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; particularly by *Bertram*, or Ratram, a Monk of Corbey[s], and John Scot, called *Erigena*, becauſe he was a native of Erin, or Irin, that

[q] In 1215, at the third Lateran Council; See Cave's Hiſt. Lit. under Innocent the Third.

[r] See the Diſputation at Oxford in 1554, before Latimer, &c. ſuffered: Collier, Vol. 2, page 368, or Fox's Martyrol. (by the *date*). or Syntagma, p. 120. Angl. Confeſſio, from Jewel's works.—immutari, &c. ſomniarunt; neque adhuc potuerunt unquam ſatis inter ſe de ſuo ſomnio *convenire*.

[s] Cave's Hiſt. Lit. Vol. 2. page 2. conſpectus, or opening of 9th Century. (for *Berenger*, ſee Sect. x.)

that is, of *Ireland*. Scot's book is loſt, but Bertram's remains.

IX. This Doctrine comes under the general obſervation made on all the Popiſh Doctrines contained in the opening of the twenty-ſecond Article. And we ſhould now ſee in what way it has "given occaſion to *many ſuperſtitions*."

Some *ſuperſtitions*, to which the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation gave occaſion, will be the ſubjects of ſome of the following Articles; a few others may be mentioned.—It occaſioned the cuſtom of *ſopping* the bread in the wine;—of *reſerving* the wafer with a view to performing cures, and ſtopping public calamities;—of burning the elements to aſhes;—of making *proceſſions* in the ſtreets, during which every one preſent is to *kneel*:—of *elevating* the *Hoſtia*, that every one may ſee and *adore* his God.—This Doctrine has alſo occaſioned the multiplying of *Altars* in churches; and has drawn the attention of the Romaniſts from every part of public worſhip which we look upon as valuable.—The Romiſh caſuiſts very gravely determine what[t] puniſhments are to be inflicted on a *mouſe*, that is ſo unfortunate as to gnaw the conſecrated elements: and how things are to be conducted in caſe a ſick Prieſt ſhould vomit them up.

On the other hand, the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is thought to have put a[u] ſtop to the cuſtom of giving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to *Infants* in the Weſtern Church, They uſed to have it given by the Prieſt, who dipped his finger in the chalice, and then put it into the child's

[t] See the original paſſages in Bennet's Directions, under this 29th Article.—See alſo Moſheim, Cent. 13. 2. 4. 2.—And the thing is mentioned briefly in Fulke's Rhemiſh Teſtament on 1 Cor. xi. 29. oppoſite to folio 288.

[u] Wall, page 516, 4to. or 2. 9 16.

child's mouth. But the moderns mix the bread with the wine, "and put to the child's lips a drop or two of that mixture quickly after his Baptiſm; after which he receives no more till the age of diſcretion[x]."

x. But let us come to the age of the *Reformation*. The doctrine of which we are ſpeaking, was one of thoſe which were objected to by the *Waldenſes*[y]: But yet it was not decidedly oppoſed for ſome time: even *Luther* only changed tranſubſtantiation into *conſubſtantiation*[z]. *Wickliffe* had, in ſome parts of his works, expreſſed himſelf ſtrongly againſt this abuſe, but *Melancthon*[a] complained, that, on comparing different parts, he found him confuſed in the queſtion about the Holy Sacrament. Of the forty propoſitions of Wickliffe's which the Council of *Conſtance* condemned, the three firſt relate to our preſent ſubject; (ſee Baxter on Councils, page 431, or Chap. 13. Sect. 2.) And the third is againſt the *Bodily Preſence* in general; and therefore againſt what *Luther* afterwards called Conſubſtantiation. I think John *Huſs*, and *Jerome* of Prague did not differ from Wickliffe in this, materially, if at all.

Conſubſtantiation meant, that the ſubſtance of Chriſt's Body and Blood were preſent in the Holy Sacrament *with* the ſubſtance of the bread and wine. Luther's perſiſting in this notion cauſed an unhappy

[x] Wall, page 515. 517.

[y] Wall, 2. 7. 3. page 386.

[z] This may juſt be mentioned here, as Luther is ſaid to have borrowed his Conſubſtantiation from *Berenger*, in 1035: ſee his Recantation in Cave's Hiſt. Lit. Conſpectus Sæc. xi.—But Berenger made ſeveral Recantations; they are not to be depended on. What Fox gives as his (Berenger's) real ſentiments, out of a Book of Lanfranc's, ſeems moſt worthy of notice. (Mart. Vol. 2. page 458).—Berenger, from that, ſeems to have thought much as we do now.

[a] Gilpin's Lives of Reformers, page 65.

unhappy diviſion amongſt the reformed Churches, which, I believe, continues to this day.

Luther explained his conſubſtantiation by ſaying, that in *red-hot iron*, two ſubſtances are united, *heat*[b] and *fire:* he ſupported it, by what was called *Ubiquity*; by affirming, that the Son of God was *every where*, *ubique*;—or thus; God is every where; Chriſt ſits at the *right hand* of God; therefore Chriſt is every where[c].—Yet Luther was, in general, a good and forcible reaſoner: but when a man is determined to maintain by reaſoning a doctrine totally unintelligible to reaſon, he muſt take the appearance of argument for the reality. What led him, probably, to change tranſubſtantiation for conſubſtantiation, was, what is urged in our Article, that Tranſubſtantiation takes away the eſſence of a Sacrament[d].

The *Romaniſts* make the ordinance of which we are ſpeaking, very complicated and gaudy; and they profeſs the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation without reſerve[e]. I may uſe the preſent tenſe, as they have made no material changes, that I know of, ſince the age with which we are now concerned, the Age of the Reformation. The acts of the Council of Trent, and the Catechiſm made by its direction, will ſupply us with any particulars of which we may want to take notice.

The

[b] Maclaine's Moſheim, Cent. 16. 1. 2. 21. and note (z).

[c] Luther is ſaid to have given up this ubiquity as a proof of Chriſt's corporal preſence in the Euchariſt; but rigid Lutherans were ſtill Ubiquitarians.

[d] "Neceſſitas ipſa veritatis ſacramenti exigere videtur," &c. —Confeſſio Wittemb. de Euchariſtiâ, Syntagma, page 159, 160.

[e] See Art. 1. Sect. XVIII. Vol. 2. page 275, Note (c), where is an expreſſion from a French Prayer-book: after Communion the communicant is directed to ſay, "Seigneur, &c. je *vous* ai reçu avec joie." This order is alſo given;

Ton *Créateur* tu recevras
Au moins à Paques, &c.

The thirteenth Seſſion of the Council, is upon the Euchariſt. The firſt chapter declares, that there is no contradiction between Chriſt's body being always naturally at the right hand of God, and *ſacramentally* in other places: where ideas are wanting, how uſeful are words! Yet ſuch manner of exiſtence, we are told, is not expreſſible by words, but is poſſible to God. Afterwards we are told, that, in the ſacrament, the *real* Body of Chriſt exiſts ſub *ſpecie* panis, &c.—Nay, that the *whole* body of Chriſt exiſts in every *particle* of the bread, and in every particle of the wine: and there is a *converſion* of ſubſtance, which is aptly (propriè) called *Tranſubſtantiation*.—That the ſame worſhip of *Latria* is due to the conſecrated elements, which is due to the *true God*. That *proceſſions* are proper, as a *triumph* over Hereſy, and to make it *pine* away, or be aſhamed. That the cuſtom of *reſerving*, is ancient, and that of carrying the Sacrament to the *ſick*, neceſſary. That the proper preparation for receiving is ſacramental Confeſſion.—The *Anathemas* are eleven, the ſecond againſt Conſubſtantiation.

The *Catechiſm* has the ſame things; with reaſons; and ſome things more minute. The Sacrament is to be taken *faſting*. The bread ought to be *wheat*; it ought to be *unleavened*, but may be leavened.—"The Church of God *always* mingled *water* with the wine;" for ſeveral "weighty" reaſons; ſo that ſuch mixture "may not be neglected under *mortal ſin*." The Euchariſt is to be judged of "by *Faith*, not by ſenſe." Our ſenſes tell us "nothing at all but the *Species* of bread and wine." "*They* will judge that there is only bread and wine in the Sacrament." "One may ſee indeed all the *accidents* of bread and wine, which yet are inherent in no ſubſtance"—(what would Mr. *Locke* ſay to this?)

this?) "but they conſiſt of themſelves."—"We are not too narrowly to inquire into Tranſubſtantiation."—If the Romaniſts had been "ſeen to eat" their "Lord under his own Species," they could not eaſily have avoided the "reproach of Infidels," as feeding upon human fleſh and blood, "the moſt *horrid* thing in the world!"

Though theſe things were ſettled by the Council, yet we muſt not conceive that they were ſettled without debate or diſſenſion: The *Cordeliers* and the *Jacobins* were oppoſed in their methods of ſolving the bodily[f] preſence.

The Feſtival of *Corpus Chriſti* or the *Holy*[g] *Sacrament* is ſaid to have been founded on a Revelation, which one *Juliana*, a devout woman of Leige, declared ſhe had received. Her pretenſions were ſupported by the Biſhop, (in 1264) and afterwards by Pope Urban IV. and, in 1311, by Clement V. —The Feſtival is to be looked upon as *in fact*, the *cauſe* of Tranſubſtantiation, as a ſettled and popular *Doctrine*. It ſeems to be held the Thurſday after Trinity-Sunday:—It is ſometimes called *Fête de Dieu*.

Dupin[h] is willing to give up the word tranſubſtantiation; but ſtill it muſt be profeſſed, "that the Bread and wine are *really changed* into the body and blood of Chriſt," &c. The word *ſubſtance* is dropped.

After the Romaniſts, let us look at the *Reformed*[i] churches.—*Luther's* opinion of the *preſence* of

[f] Voltaire, Vol. 10, 4to. page 156.—Du Concile de Trente. Probably from Fra. Paolo. (alias Sarpi).

[g] Moſheim, Cent. 13. Part 2. Chap. 4. Sect. 2. octavo, Vol. 3. page 108.

[h] Append. to Moſheim.

[i] I mean here all thoſe Churches which ſeparated from *Rome*. Abroad, thoſe Churches are called *reformed*, which ſeparated from

of Chriſt in the Euchariſt was mentioned juſt now; as well as the ſeparation occaſioned by his perſiſting in it. This ſeparation conſiſts of a number of particulars; but it may ſuffice for us to be aware, that the great opponent to Luther, was *Zuingle*, who formed the Churches in Switzerland; and afterwards, *Calvin*. Zuingle looked upon the Sacramental Bread and Wine as only *ſigns* and *ſymbols*[k]; but it does not appear to me, that he did not look upon the ſacrament as a commemoration of a *ſacrifice*.—The greateſt difficulty ariſes from the Hiſtory of *Melancthon*, about whom we are intereſted as the divine on whoſe judgment very great reliance was placed in the forming of our own Articles. The truth may be, that, as he was of a very mild temper, and a ſingular lover of peace, and as he had ſenſe enough to ſee, that the preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, is a thing intirely above human comprehenſion, and one that does not immediately affect practice, or virtue, he might ſpeak undecidedly, and endeavour to pacify each of the contending parties, as much as poſſible, by reſpectful attention and candour.—He was connected with Luther, and in conference[l] appeared as one of his company; and he is ſometimes ſaid to have been of his opinion; but ſometimes he is ſaid to have thought differently from him: I mean on the ſubject now before us[m].—It is certain,

from the *Lutherans*, under Zuingle, *Calvin*, &c.—See Moſheim, Index, or Vol 4, 8vo. page 54. 62.—And, if I miſtake not, they are ſometimes all together called *Calviniſts*.

[k] Moſheim, Cent. xvi. Sect. 3. part 2. 2. 4.—Alſo Cent. xvi. Sect. 1. Chap. 2. Sect. 21.—And compare the Helvetic Confeſſion, page 71, with that of Wittemberg, page 159.

[l] At Marpurg, in 1529.—Moſheim, Cent. 16. 1. 2. 28.—Alſo Cent. 16. Sect. 3. Part 2. 2. 4. note (y).

[m] Compare Moſheim, Cent. 16, 3. 2. 1. 27. with Mackaine's Note (r).

certain, that the confeſſion of *Augſburg*, which, was drawn by him, favours Conſubſtantiation[n]; but in that Confeſſion he is thought to have complied too much for the ſake of peace. From what has been ſaid, we know what to expect in the Confeſſions of the Reformed. Corporal preſence is the moſt fully profeſſed in that of Wittemberg[o], and the moſt avoided in that of the Helvetic Churches.—The opprobrious name given to thoſe who denied the corporal preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, was that of *Sacramentarians*[p], or *Sacramentaries*.

XI. Let us now come to our own Country.—In the reign of Henry VIII. very great ſtreſs was laid upon the corporal preſence; nay, ſeveral people ſuffered *death* for oppoſing it. *Cranmer* was, at that time, a Lutheran[q], and the King himſelf raged againſt Sacramentaries. In 1539 the act was paſſed which made a kind of regreſs of the Reformation; it was called, *The Statute of the ſix Articles*, the firſt Article affirmed the corporal[r] preſence; and if any perſons preached or wrote againſt it, they were to be burnt, and their eſtates forfeited. In 1543 the "*Neceſſary Doctrine*," &c. was publiſhed; it maintains, in conformity to the ſtatute, the Law of the Land, that in the "moſt high ſacrament of the Altar," the bread and wine are "turned to the very *ſubſtance* of the body and blood of our Saviour Jeſu Chriſt." Yet when we have

[n] Syntagma, page 14. x.

[o] Syntagma, page 159. for *Helvetic*, page 71. 73.

[p] Neal's Hiſt. Pur. Vol. 1. page 20. 4to. A. D. 1538.—Moſheim, Vol. 4. 8vo. page 87. Maclaine's Note.

[q] Cranmer's progreſſion was the natural one; giving up Tranſubſtantiation he kept ſome belief of corporal preſence: giving up that, as untenable, he became a Sacramentarian.—He was famous for reſiſting, in Parliament, the ſtatute of the *ſix Articles*: ſee his Life by Strype.

[r] Neal, A. D. 1539.

have taken it, it "is not turned into *our ſubſtance:*" there are ſeveral other things mentioned, but they are only popiſh; and therefore they have occurred already: As, that the ſacrament is to be received *faſting*, &c.—But when a church, which had been trying to reform, could accept or retain the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, we need not wonder at its retaining anything elſe[s].

In the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. it is not ſo eaſy to give an account of the doctrine of the Engliſh Church. In his *Firſt Book*, (that is, of Common Prayer) the *Wafer* is continued[t], only it is to be ſo large that it may be *broken*; but "men muſt not think leſs to be received in part than in the whole; but in each of them the *whole body* of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt."

Afterwards both *Tranſubſtantiation* and all ways of bodily preſence, ſeem to have been decidedly *rejected:* this appears from our Article of 1552, and from the Reformatio Legum.

In the *Reformatio Legum* we find a pretty long *chapter*[u] againſt both Tranſubſtantiation and Conſubſtantiation, and againſt corporal preſence in general. The expreſſions are much the ſame with thoſe of the Article of 1552. We alſo find a Chapter[x] againſt *ubiquity*; ſaying, that Chriſt, in his *divine* nature, might be every where (*ubique*) even after his reſurrection; but that in his *human* nature he could not: his body, if human, muſt be in ſome *one place* at one time: this chapter alſo agrees exactly with our Article of 1552.

Latimer,

[s] The profaneneſs of the *Anabaptiſts*, mentioned in Art. xxv. Sect. 11. might be here recollected. Indeed it would have ſuited our preſent Article full as well as that about Sacraments in general.

[t] Wheatly, page 332. A. D. 1548. the ſecond Book was in 1552.

[u] De Hæreſibus, cap. 19. [x] De Summâ Trinitate, cap. 4.

Latimer, in the Diſputation at Oxford in 1554, (or in the *Paper* which he gave in,) ſaid, that he maintained the *real* preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, but not the *corporal* preſence. (See Fox, or Collier, A. D. 1554). Archbiſhop Secker, (Lect. Vol. 2. page 251.) ſays, the Church has always acknowledged the *real* preſence. Yet Wheatly, (page 320.) ſays, it (real, eſſential preſence of Chriſt's natural fleſh and blood,) was not allowed at firſt, in the time of Edward VI. it ſeemed to approach ſo near Tranſubſtantiation. —Fulke on Heb. i. 6. denies *reality* of Chriſt's *corporal* preſence.

Queen *Elizabeth* ſeems to have been willing to *comprehend* as many as poſſible in the new Engliſh Church; and with that view to have endeavoured to uſe a language, which all might adopt, who did not profeſs Tranſubſtantiation[y] in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, and which might nevertheleſs be uſed by thoſe who did not admit any preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt perfectly corporal. Such language would comprehend all Lutherans, and ſome Papiſts[z]. I think this remark will be ſufficient to account for the change of the expreſſions in the twenty-eighth of our preſent Articles; (on which Biſhop Burnet ſpeaks judiciouſly) and for the language in the ſecond Book of Homilies; both as to the word "*Incorporation*[a]," and the inſiſting on *Faith* and *ſpiritual* eating of the Sacrament.

There

[y] See Wheatly, end of Communion-office.—Moſheim, Vol. 4. 8vo. page 37. or, Cent. 16. 3. 2. 1. 27.

[z] See Sect. XI.—See alſo Moſheim, Cent. 16. 3. 2. 2. 6. or page 70, 71, 8vo. Vol. 4.

[a] Homily: on worthy receiving of the Sacrament, page 350, 8vo. and 351. The language now is very like *Calvin's*; ſee Inſtitutes, 4. 17. 32.—"*Incorporate*," occurs in the next prayer before

There was publiſhed, in Latin, in the year 1560, a very ſhort office for a Communion at *Funerals*, if the friends and neighbours of the deceaſed[b] choſe to attend. The *Collect* is the laſt Prayer in our burial-ſervice; "O merciful God," &c.—And there is an Epiſtle, and a choice of two Goſpels. I ſuppoſe the reſt would be taken from the Communion-ſervice; beginning, probably, at the Lord's Prayer.—Indeed if the Prieſt began there, ſome Collect, Epiſtle and Goſpel would be wanting.

Of the *Familiſts*, we ſaid enough under the twenty-fifth Article; and ſo of the *Socinians*: and in general of thoſe, who, near the time of the Reformation, ſpoke of the ſacraments in general as *mere ſigns* of unity amongſt Chriſtians —I doubt how near thoſe moderns come to them, who make the Lord's Supper a *mere Commemoration*.

The chief part of the Doctrine of the *Quakers*, with regard to the Lord's Supper, ſeems to be this; they look upon what was done by Chriſt in the inſtitution, as a *ſhadow*, intended to vaniſh, or ceaſe; the *ſubſtance* being *internal*[c], and intended to remain.—Col. ii. 16, 17. applied to the Lord's Supper, might expreſs their mind.—This doctrine is generally, I believe, conſidered as invented in the laſt century; but thoſe *Petrobruſſians*, who were juſt mentioned before[d], ſeem to have been *Popiſh* Quakers, as it were, in the eleventh Century, when Tranſubſtantiation was taken for granted. Their preachers ſaid, that the Clergy deceived the People "notoriouſly; for the Body of

before Gloria in excelſis. Alluding to 1 Cor. xii. 27, and parallels.

[b] Sparrow's collection, page 200.

[c] Barclay's Apology, prop. 13.

[d] Art. XXVIII. Sect. XIV.

of Chriſt was only *once made*, by himſelf, at the ſupper before his Paſſion[e]: and was once only, viz. at that time, given to his Diſciples. Since that time it was never made by any one, nor given to any one."

In *Weſley's*[f] Letters we have an account of the notions of the *myſtics*; they need not "the Lord's Supper, for they never ceaſe to remember Chriſt in the moſt acceptable manner."—"Love is your end." "Different men are led in different ways" (to Love): "You muſt judge for yourſelf. Perhaps faſting may help you for a time, and *perhaps* the holy Communion."

XII. Thoſe whom we commonly call *Diſſenters*, in England, *ſit* at the table on which the Lord's Supper is celebrated. The Miniſter preſides, according to the *Directory*[g], breaks the bread, with prayer and benediction, and gives it to ſome one, but not to every one: and ſo of the Cup.—The ceremony may be grave, decent, and edifying, for anything I ſee.—Dr. Prieſtley mentions[h] a Mr. *Henry*, whoſe treatiſe on the Sacrament is much read, and he refers to a chapter, intitled, "*Sights to be ſeen at the Lord's Table.*"—This Title has a myſtical ſound, and Dr. Prieſtley ſays, that *experiences* are ſometimes examined into before admiſſion to the Sacrament.

The *Baptiſts* alſo receive the Sacraments *ſitting* "at a common table," "and handing the Elements[i] one to another."

XIII. Early

[e] Wall, end of Chap. 7. Part 2.

[f] Page 60. 62. 13th Letter.

[g] See Directory; and Preface to Grey's Hudibras. I have been told, that one kind of Diſſenters will receive a Teacher or Paſtor, from another kind; but will not *ſit down* with him: that is, will not receive the Sacrament with him.

[h] Free Addreſs, page 53.

[i] See Wall, Part 2. Chap. 8. page 446, 4to.

XIII. Early in this eighteenth Century Biſhop *Hoadley* contended, that the Lord's Supper is a *bare memorial* of the Death of Chriſt. Biſhop Warburton, that it is a *feaſt on a ſacrifice*. This laſt ſeems the moſt *approved* opinion, and is ably defended[k] by *Biſhop Cleaver*. Dr. *Balguy's* ſeventh Charge amounts to the ſame thing.—But if Biſhop Hoadley looked upon the *Death* of Chriſt as a ſacrifice, a memorial of his death, conſidered *in that light*, would not perhaps differ materially from a Feaſt on a ſacrifice; where no real ſacrifice is performed[l]: and would agree with the expreſſions of our[m] *Catechiſm*.—Nay, when the modern Socinians make the Sacrament a bare memorial of Chriſt's death, and throw out all notion of a ſacrifice, I do not regard the difference as one belonging to the *Sacrament*; but to the nature and efficacy of the *Death* of Chriſt, or the doctrine of *Atonement*. Each party commemorates the Death of Chriſt as what he imagines it be.

XIV. We next come to the *Explanation*.

The *Title* is taken from 1 Cor. xi. 20. The Article conſiſts of four Paragraphs.

XV. The firſt thing it does is, to affirm, of the Lord's Supper in particular, what was before affirmed of Sacraments in general, that it is not a mere *badge*. Yet it *is* a Badge; and the way in which it is a badge, is by denoting Chriſtian ſocial kindneſs, ſuch as would be ſhewn by an *Agape*, or feaſt of Charity, which meant only to bring thoſe

[k] Two Sermons, Oxford, 1789.—Warburton's Sermon is called a *Rational* account, &c.—Hoadley's a *Plain* account, &c.

[l] Maclaine thinks, that Bp. Hoadley's notion is the ſame with that of *Zuingle*. Moſheim, Vol. 3. 8vo. page 331. or Cent. 16. 1. 2. 21. Note (a).—Had they the ſame notion of the death of Chriſt as a ſacrifice?

[m] "For the continual remembrance (memorial) of the *Sacrifice* of the Death of Chriſt," &c.

thoſe of the ſame community together, in a way likely to produce chearfulneſs, good humour, and benevolence. The Lord's Supper uſed to be called *the Sacrament of Peace and Charity:* (Trent Cat. page 159. bottom.)

XVI. "But rather"—verùm potiùs—this does not *exclude* the notion of a Badge, but only declares the Lord's Supper to be ſomething *more*; to have, as a Sacrament, not only an external, but an internal part.

XVII. "A Sacrament of our Redemption by Chriſt's Death." In Art. XXIX. thoſe who take the Lord's Supper, are ſaid to "eat and drink the *ſign* or *Sacrament* of ſo great a thing" (as the body and blood of Chriſt.)—From this compariſon it appears, that "*Sacrament*," in our Article, means much the ſame as "*ſign*;" which agrees with the account before[n] given of the moſt literal or proper ſignification of the word Sacrament. *Redemption* was explained in the Appendix to the eleventh Article[o].—The Lord's Supper then is an emblematical repreſentation of our being redeemed from ſpiritual evil, or bondage, by the *Death* of Chriſt: but in what *way* has the Death of Chriſt any efficacy to free us from ſpiritual evil? by being a *ſacrifice:* (that it *was* a ſacrifice, has been proved *before*[p]:) therefore the Lord's Supper is a *ſacrifice-feaſt*; or a feaſt *upon* a ſacrifice: in ſome reſpects a *paſchal* ſupper.

XVIII. If this be underſtood, all the reſt follows naturally; as is implied by, "*Inſomuch that:*" In all ſuch Feaſts there was a *Communion*, that is, a *Communication*, or a *partaking in common*[q], (*in common* with the *gueſts*; in common, in ſome ſort, with the

[n] Art. XXV. Sect. 11. [o] App. to Art. XI. Sect. XVII.
[p] Append. to Art. XI. Sect. XIV. XXII. XXVII. XXVIII.
[q] Dr. Balguy, page 312.

the *Being* to whom the ſacrifice was offered[r]) of all the *benefits* at which ſacrifice aimed; as pardon, favour, thankſgiving.—Should not this be ſatisfactory, the remainder of our paragraph is a proof of it, from ſcripture; expreſſing indeed, at the ſame time, what might always be a tacit condition, the *worthineſs* of the receiver: that he who partakes, muſt not be wholly unworthy, is ſo plain, that the Scripture, may, at any time, take it for granted; we ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of it under the next Article. The paſſage introduced, in proof or confirmation, is 1 Cor. x. 16. the word in the Engliſh Article is *partaking*, but in the Latin Article it is *communicatio*; which is Latin for either partaking, or "*communion*;" that is, partaking *in common:* Communion is the word in our Engliſh Bible. In the Vulgate there is firſt *communicatio* and then *participatio*; theſe muſt have the ſame meaning, the Greek to them both being κοινωνια[s]. —To be ſure, a ſingle, unconnected ſentence of Scripture in an Article, would make a kind of identical propoſition; for in every Article we mean only, that each thing affirmed can be proved by ſcripture; and therefore when the thing affirmed is itſelf ſcripture, we ſay, in effect, ſcripture may be proved by ſcripture:—However, in difficult ſubjects, we had perhaps moſt of us rather ſubſcribe to a ſentence of ſcripture than to an human interpretation of it. And a ſentence of Scripture may reaſonably be introduced, to confirm ſomething elſe which is not Scripture. But let us now come to the ſecond paragraph.

XIX. "Tranſub-

[r] Damaſcene has both theſe connexions, Trent. Cat. Sect. 5. or page 195.

[s] I am not ſure that the ſcope of this reaſoning will be immediately perceived, except the reader finds, that the concluding expreſſions of the firſt paragraph of the article, might, without it, give too little feeling of a *ſocial* partaking.

XIX. "Tranſubſtantiation" was explained in the Hiſtory. It "cannot be proved by Holy writ;"—this expreſſion will occaſion what may be called *indirect* proof; that is, anſwering the arguments of the Romaniſts, which to our doctrines, are *objections*. But that which follows will bring on direct proof; it "is repugnant to the plain words of ſcripture."—"*plain words*"—all ſides talk of *plain* words: we will only obſerve, that ſome words are more plain when uſed metaphorically, than literally: as, a *Plagiary*, in Engliſh; *pravus*, in Latin; *Saiſiſſement*[t], in French.

"Overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament"—by confounding the outward and viſible ſign, with the "inward and ſpiritual Grace:"—the figure, with the thing figured[u]. Tranſubſtantiation makes the bread (the ſign) to be alſo the Body of Chriſt, (the thing ſignified).—Explanation here, is proof.

The "ſuperſtitions" to which this doctrine hath given occaſion, were mentioned in the Hiſtory[x]; and no farther proof can be wanting, that the Doctrine "hath given occaſion to many ſuperſtitions."

XX. The third paragraph is not more eaſy to explain than that in whoſe room it was ſubſtituted.—It mentions only the *Body* of Chriſt; but that is for the ſake of ſimplicity and perſpicuity. What is ſaid

[t] Dict. Acad. ſays of ſaiſiſſement "il n'eſt pas en uſage au *propre*, mais ſeulment au *figuré*. There are many ſuch words. *Candor* is never uſed for whiteneſs. I never knew any ſenſe of *unwarrantable* but the figurative, till a Keeper in a King's Foreſt told me, certain *Veniſon* was unwarrantable; that is, could not be ſent in return to the *Warrants* iſſued by the Officers of the Crown

[u] Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. Luke xxii. Sect. 7.—Heb. i. Sect. 1.

[x] Sect. IX.

ſaid of the Body may be extended to the *Blood*, by parity of reaſoning.—Let us, in order to explain it, read, in addition to what was read before[y], John vi. 48—58.—And compare Heb. x. 5—10. From theſe two ſcriptures, one may get ſome idea, how, by eating the ſacramental Bread, or Bread in a ſacrifice-feaſt, one may be ſaid to eat the Body of Chriſt. Whether John vi. relate to the Lord's ſupper, has been diſputed; I think Biſhop Cleaver proves, that it does as a *prophetic* intimation; but we are ſure that many people have ſo underſtood it; and ſo probably did they who compiled our Article[z]. In that chapter ſomething is meant, which is not intended to be expreſſed with perfect clearneſs. It may, as a prophetic intimation, be interpreted by the Inſtitution of the Sacrament, as an *event*; and by a compariſon of Chriſt's reaſoning in the ſixth Chapter, about the Lord's Supper, with his reaſoning to Nicodemus in the third, about Baptiſm. The difficulty lies in giving a meaning to ſuch expreſſions as that in our Catechiſm, "*verily and indeed taken*," when uſed by thoſe who reject both Tranſubſtantiation and Conſubſtantiation; and deny, in general, the corporal preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt. It is a difficulty which ſeems to have occaſioned ſome unſteadineſs of language, ſome expreſſions ſeemingly inconſiſtent in thoſe, who have departed both from the Romiſh and the Lutheran Church[a]. My own idea

[y] Sect. 1.

[z] Biſhop Cleaver ſays, that the *Reformers* were *againſt* applying John vi. to the Sacrament. He excepts (in ſome degree) *Cranmer*. Two Sermons, page 25.

[a] Barclay obſerves this in his Apology, Prop. 13. Sect. 3 & 4. *Reality* (of Chriſt's preſence) ſeems to be the moſt unſteadily uſed; ſometimes with *Body*, ſometimes without —See Sect. xi. about Latimer, &c. We *eat* Chriſt's body *really*; we cannot eat

idea is this; when I ſay, that, in the Lord's Supper, the inward part, or thing ſignified, is, "The Body and blood of Chriſt, which are *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper;" I mean, that, though I may not know preciſely what may be intended in Scripture by our eating Chriſt's Body and drinking his blood, yet I believe, that *whatever* is meant, a worthy receiver comes up to *that meaning*: he performs that action which is preſcribed; he obtains that good which is annexed to it.

If this be admitted, great *latitude* is allowed, when ſcripture ſpeaks of eating the Fleſh of Chriſt and drinking his blood, to different notions, and conceptions, or imaginations about particular *means*; or intermediate ſteps: and in things above reaſon why ſhould latitude be denied? One man thinks, that eating Chriſt's fleſh and drinking his blood, means only a bare *commemoration* of his death: another thinks, it is emblematically *accepting* the benefits of the Chriſtian *ſacrifice*: a third thinks, that it is eating, in ſome inexplicable way, the *ſubſtance* of Chriſt's Body, into which the Bread has been *changed*: a fourth, that it is eating the *ſubſtance* of Chriſt's body *along with* the ſacramental bread. Theſe are but different *fancies* or conjectures of *men* about the particular *means* of bringing about what is called in Scripture[b] *eating the fleſh of Chriſt*: ſtill therefore I ſay, whichever of theſe is right,

eat that really which is not *preſent*; thus men ſeem to have been led to acknowledge the *real preſence*, even of Chriſt's *body*; though they deny the *corporal* preſence.

[b] The Romaniſts and Lutherans would not deny, either that eating Chriſt's Body is a *commemoration*, or a partaking of the benefits of a *Sacrifice*; nor ſhould we *Calviniſts*; but ſtill, every thing *between* the precept "take eat," and the *obedience* to it (including the *reward*, or benefit), is *human*.

right, or if *none* of them be right, the *worthy* communicant, *does* that which is really *meant* in ſcripture by eating the fleſh of Chriſt, and drinking his blood; and he gains all the benefit which God intended ſhould ariſe from ſuch eating and drinking. He does that which God hath commanded; and he obtains that which God doth promiſe.

I could wiſh any one, who enters into what I have ſaid, to try whether the paragraph before us, would *exclude* the *Lutheran*, or even the *Romaniſt*. The Romaniſt, who profeſſed Tranſubſtantiation in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, could not ſubſcribe to the *preceding* paragraph; but would he not own that even *his* eating the Body of Chriſt is a *ſpiritual*[c] eating? he does not mean to ſatisfy his *hunger*; and he profeſſes, that what he eats does not *mix*[d] with his *bodily* ſubſtance. And as to *Faith*, he profeſſes that "we muſt judge of the Euchariſt by[e] Faith;" nay, in the form of conſecration he calls it "*the myſtery of Faith.*" And as all muſt own, that the eating of the fleſh of Chriſt is a ſpiritual and not a carnal[f] eating, all muſt likewiſe own, that Faith is more properly the inſtrument, than the Jaw is. The Trent Catechiſm ſays, "what food is to the Body, that the Euchariſt is to the[g] *Spirit.*" Romaniſts ſpeak of Faith chiefly with a view to their incredible

[c] It is called "our *ſpiritual meat*," Trent Catech. Sect. 5. or page 196 —*Spiritual* eating is diſtinguiſhed from *ſacramental* eating, and both are required. Council, Seſſ. 13. Cap. 7. and Canon 8. but ſacramental eating is not ordinary eating.

[d] Trent Catechiſm, Sect. 49, or page 220, bottom.—Sect. xi. of this Article. This might be held, in order to obviate the charge of *Stercorianiſm*. (Moſheim, Index).

[e] Trent Catech. Sect. 23, 24 or page 206, 207.

[f] Panis cibus mentis eſt, non cibus ventris.—Cypr. See Synt. page 121.

[g] Sect. 49. page 220.

incredible converſion of bread into Fleſh; we, of Chriſtian Faith in general; yet they ſometimes uſe it in our ſenſe.

When I think in this train, and conſider how tranſcendent and aſtoniſhing a thing the Euchariſt muſt, on *any* ſuppoſition, appear to one who fixes his thoughts fairly upon it; how ſolemn and affecting the firſt Inſtitution, eſpecially when opening the ſenſe of the prophetic intimation recorded by St. John; how ſtrong the declarations of the neceſſity of eating the Fleſh of Chriſt and drinking his blood: I ſeem to be in the place of thoſe perſons of our [h] perſuaſion, who have ſcarcely known how to expreſs themſelves, ſo as to deny the corporal preſence of Chriſt, and yet not let down the Ordinance, nor give the Romaniſts and Lutherans a pretence for charging them with want of veneration for it. I feel inclined to uſe the ſame expreſſions, though ſenſible of the ſame difficulties. Though their expreſſions ſeem to vary, yet they always ſpeak ſo as to be conſiſtent with my idea juſt now ſtated: they *may* always mean, by receiving *really* the Body and Blood of Chriſt, receiving the Sacrament according to the *real meaning* of Scripture, be that what it will: in *oppoſition* to, mere bread, vain ceremonies, empty ſigns, unfeeling formality. They are all words explaining by oppoſition, or attempting to give the force of ſcripture.

As I doubt not but the high and ſtrong expreſſions which thoſe of our perſuaſion uſe, have given offence or diſguſt, or cauſed perplexity, to many, and made them prefer Popery, Socinianiſm, or

[h] I include, in this caſe, the Calviniſts, and all who have departed from the Romiſh and Lutheran churches; (except Socinians and Quakers, &c.)

or Quakeriſm; I will refer to ſome places where they are uſed; in hopes that, in the light in which I have placed them, they may be thought natural, and ſuch as ariſe from right notions and feelings. I will, at the ſame time, refer to ſome paſſages in which our idea of the Lord's Supper is illuſtrated by oppoſition and[i] contradiſtinction. Dr. *Balguy* defends "*verily and indeed*," by the *context*.

XXI. The *practices* mentioned in the fourth paragraph have been explained in the Hiſtory.—The expreſſion "*By Chriſt's ordinance*," may be obſerved, becauſe by the ordinance of ſome ancient *churches*, ſome elements were[k] reſerved. Biſhop Burnet accounts for their being ſo[l]: circumſtances, at ſome times required it; but ancient churches did not reſerve their *God* in any ſacrarium, nor expoſe him to the inroads of mice; for they did not believe in Tranſubſtantiation. Nor does it ſeem as if they had encouraged ſuperſtitions.—Generally ſpeaking, they conſidered circumſtances; they left off carrying the ſacrament to the ſick, becauſe of ſome abuſes, and ſo of the Agapæ: and I doubt not but anything, not quite eſſential, would

[i] See the prayer preceding the prayer of Conſecration.—And Reformatio Legum, de Hæreſibus, cap. 19.—Maclaine's Note, or Moſheim, Cent. 16. 3. 2. 2. 12. (and 6.)—Calvin's Inſtitutes, 4. 17. 32. and Barclay's mention of it, Apol. 13. 3, 4.—Fox's Acts and Monuments (or Martyrology), Vol. 3. page 82. col. 2. diſp. in April 1554, at Oxford.—Syntagma page 120, part of the Engliſh Confeſſion, from Biſhop Jewell.—Fulke on the Rhemiſh Teſtament, fol. 152. (comp. on Heb. i. 6)—*Homily* on the worthy receiving of the Sacrament, Part 1ſt. (every word muſt be attended to, in ſome places:) "*incorporation*" occurs twice (John vi. 56.) the latter time near the end. The ſcriptural *Metaphors* of Head and Members ("incorporation") vine and branches, &c. are well introduced. This is the 15th Homily of the 2d book, or the 27th of the whole number.—Dr. *Balguy's* 7th charge would illuſtrate the Article, if the expreſſions were carefully compared.

[k] Sect. v. [l] Page 429. 8vo.

would have been left off, if it had given occaſion to ſuperſtitions or ſcandals. But we are only *explaining*, the expreſſion, "by Chriſt's Ordinance."

XXII. Come we now to our *Proof*.

The Article ſeems to contain *ſix* propoſitions.

1. The Lord's Supper has an *external* part, or *Sign*.

2. It has an *internal* part, or "ſpiritual *Grace*;" that is, it denotes or repreſents our *redemption* by the *death* of Chriſt.

3. Tranſubſtantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ.

4. It is repugnant to Scripture.

5. The Body of Chriſt is, in the Lord's Supper, eaten *ſpiritually*; by *Faith*.

6. Chriſt has not ordained that the Sacrament under conſideration, ſhould be *reſerved*, *carried about*, *elevated*, or *adored*.

XXIII. That the Sacrament of the Lord's ſupper has an *external* part, is ſufficiently proved by the *inſtitution*.—Matt. xxvi. 26.—Mark xiv. 22.—Luke xxii. 19.—1 Cor. xi. 23. with the practice mentioned 1 Cor. x. 16. made perpetual, 1 Cor. xi. 26.—What better proof could be required?

This external part of the Ordinance being viſible, and peculiar to Chriſtians, muſt be a *Badge*. And whatever is a badge of Chriſtians muſt be a ſign of mutual *affection*: ſee John xiii. 35.—1 Cor. x. 17.—mutual love muſt alſo reſult from what is urged 1 Cor. xii. 13.

XXIV. The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, denotes, or repreſents, our Redemption by the Death of Chriſt: and ſo has an *internal* part, or "ſpiritual Grace."

If it be intended to commemorate Chriſt's Death, and his death be a *Sacrifice* for the Sins

of the world, it muſt be an application to one's ſelf of the benefits of ſuch ſacrifice.—That it is intended to commemorate Chriſt's *Death*, appears from the Body broken, the blood ſhed, and from 1 Cor. xi. 26.—And alſo from 1 Cor. x. 16. In the inſtitution alſo we are told, that Chriſt's blood was ſhed for us, and for the remiſſion of Sins: theſe things are there connected with the Lord's Supper; and we are told of a διαθηκη, ſometimes tranſlated *teſtament*[m], ſometimes *covenant*, in the blood of Chriſt; which being the word uſed for the Old Covenant, (Deut. iv. 13.—Exod. xxiv. 8.) implies, at leaſt, ſome great benefit, ariſing from the ſhedding of the blood of Chriſt. Which is confirmed by Heb. viii. 8, &c.—And it is ſaid, that διαθηκη, and the Hebrew ברית, are connected with *ſacrificing*: becauſe, it is thought, ſolemn *leagues* and contracts uſed to be ſealed, as it were, by ſacrifices.—But I ſee nothing about ſacrificing in Henry Stephens's accout of Διαθηκη, or διατιθημι, &c. for this, conſult Parkhurſt under בר and διαθηκη. Potter (Antiq. Vol. 1. page 252.) mentions ſacrifices at ſolemn covenants. If we allow that John vi. relates to the Lord's Supper, the benefits of it muſt be endleſs. And all *virtues* naturally

[m] Διατιθεμαι is to diſpoſe; in various ways; by *Will*; Chriſt might be conceived as both *Teſtator* (or *Diſpenſer*, author of a Diſpenſation,) and *Victim*: different characters, as well as different *types* meet in him: perhaps we do not ſee the *full force* of διαθηκη and διαθεμενος, Heb. ix. 16. if we have not theſe *different* ideas in mind.

But what *led* our Tranſlators to uſe *Teſtament* for διαθηκη? perhaps διαθεμενος:—Διαθηκη is claſſical for a *Will*, (as a mode of *diſpoſal*); but the LXX always uſe it for ברית, as *fœdus*; *Aquila* puts συνθηκη, a compact.—Chriſtians uſe Teſtament and Covenant *promiſcuouſly*; ſo that *Teſtamentum* in ſcripture often means pactum *viventium* (Stephens Greek Lex.) God *covenants* with thoſe who are called his *inheritance*; yet God's covenants are gifts, diſpenſations.

naturally reſulting from a worthy receiving, make a *part* of the "*ſpiritual*[n] *Grace*."

XXV. Tranſubſtantiation cannot be proved by Holy Writ. This muſt be deferred to the indirect proof, for the reaſon mentioned in the Explanation.

XXVI. Tranſubſtantiation is *repugnant* to ſcripture. The *Jews* did not uſe *blood* for any ſort of victuals; and the ſcriptures have made ſome ſuppoſe, that *Chriſtians* ought not. It is not therefore *likely* that Chriſt ſhould mean drinking his blood in a *literal* ſenſe. Chriſt calls the wine the *fruit of the vine* after conſecration, Matt. xxvi. 29. In John vi. Chriſt aſcribes the ſame effects to eating *Bread* of Life, and to eating his *Fleſh:* and the Papiſts own John vi. to belong[o] to the *Sacrament*: Chriſt's body may therefore as properly be *bread*, as *fleſh*; but eating the *bread of Life*, and eating *Chriſt's fleſh*, muſt be both proper, or both figurative expreſſions: they cannot be both literal, therefore they are *both figurative*. Acts iii. 21. excludes any corporal preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, which can properly be called ſuch. 1 Cor. xi. 26. "*till* he come," ſhews, that Chriſt is *not* come in the Sacrament: this laſt was Biſhop *Ridley's* argument in the day of his trial: more may be found in Fox's account of the *Diſputation* at Oxford in 1554, and that at Cambridge in 1549.

XXVII. The Body of Chriſt is, in the Lord's Supper, eaten *ſpiritually*, by *Faith*. The arguments juſt now uſed muſt tend to prove this; the Body

[n] See of Sacraments in general, Art. XXV. Sect. 11. Our Homily calls theſe virtues *Graces*, and deſcribes them well: if graces, they muſt be *ſpiritual* graces, (page 350, bottom, and 351, top) they cannot be corporeal.

[o] Rhemiſts on John vi. 53.

Body of Chriſt, in the Euchariſt, is eaten in *ſome* ſenſe; if not *really*, it muſt be *ſpiritually*.

After what was ſaid in the Explanation, about the paragraph from which this propoſition is taken, it ſeems almoſt needleſs to give a proof of it.—Every emblematical ordinance (or Sacrament) muſt be executed by Faith.—John vi. 35. is a Key to the whole diſcourſe.—And the groſs, carnal notion of the inhabitants of *Capernaum* in ver. 52. with the reception of it by Chriſt, ſhews, that carnal eating could not be meant.

XXVIII. Chriſt has not ordained that the Sacrament called the Lord's Supper ſhould be *reſerved*, carried about, elevated, or adored.—It reſts upon our adverſaries to prove that Chriſt has ordained theſe things; if they offer any arguments worthy of your conſideration, they muſt appear under our indirect proof.—The words "take, *eat*;" —"as often as ye *eat* this bread," &c.—ſeem to prove the Romiſh ſuperſtitions here mentioned, to be even *repugnant* to Scripture: as they ſeem to prove the deſign of Scripture to be, that the ſacred Bread ſhould be *eaten*: eating it would cut off the reſt.—Beſides, all the four practices here mentioned are grounded on *Tranſubſtantiation*; that being diſproved, theſe are diſproved by conſequence.

I may cloſe this direct proof with a paſſage from Dr. Middleton's Preface to his Letter from Rome; page lxxv. &c.—He ſays, that it was too *abſurd* a thing even for Heathens, to worſhip that which they[p] eat. Yet in fact, the *elevation of the Hoſt* is ſo ſtriking a ceremony, and ſo affecting to the devout, through the help of ſympathy; beſides pomp, ſhew, muſic, ſometimes military exerciſes, and

[p] Referring to Cic. de Nat. Deor. Lib. 3. 16.

and "a *preſent*[q] *Deity*," that calm reaſon ſeems unable to aboliſh it.

XXIX. Having finiſhed our direct proof, we muſt ſee what indirect may be wanted: Or what *objections* there are, which it may be worth our while to conſider.

Thoſe of the *Quakers* come firſt in our way.—The chief of what they urge ſeems to turn upon this; if we make a perpetual Sacrament of breaking bread, why do we not make a perpetual *Pedilavium*, or waſhing of feet? one is as much injoined as the other.—This was mentioned in the eleventh Chapter of our firſt Book[r].—Pedilavium *is* a ceremony in the *Greek*[s] Church; and the *Pope*, I think, goes through the ceremony of waſhing ſome people's feet. But let any one compare the inſtitution of the Lord's Supper, with John xiii. 14. and the general importance of the Lord's Supper, with that of the other ceremony, only mentioned by one Evangeliſt; let him compare the cuſtoms in Judea, of travelling, &c. with thoſe in our own country; let him compare the practice upon the one ceremony, with that upon the other; and he will find many reaſons for eſtabliſhing the rite of the Lord's Supper, which will not apply to the waſhing of feet.—This was once a Sacrament, and may now be called ſo by the Greek Chriſtians, in the extenſive ſenſe of the word; but the *five Popiſh* Sacraments which we reject, ſeem more important than this, and more adapted to general uſe; yet they fall much below our two Sacraments. Our Saviour's waſhing his Diſciples, was probably only emblematical *teaching*; it was indeed followed by a verbal precept, (John xiii. 14.) but that might be only the explanation of the action; or the moral of the Parable.—After all,

[q] Dryden's Ode on St. Cecilia's Day.

[r] Book i. Chap. xi. Sect. vi. The Lord's Supper is Sect. vii.

[s] Cave, Diſſ. 2. Νιπτηρ.

all, if our reaſons ſeem to any one inſufficient, let him imitate our Lord; he will do no harm. If the ceremonies muſt be adopted or rejected together, it is a much leſs evil to adopt the Νιπτρον, than to reject the Euchariſt.

xxx. It may be objected, that the Goſpel-Inſtitutions are not to be made complicated and abſtruſe unneceſſarily. Is not the "*Simplicity* that is[t] in Chriſt," beſt obſerved, by taking the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper as a *mere commemoration*? Biſhop Cleaver anſwers this objection in his firſt diſcourſe; and Dr. *Balguy* anſwers it, in effect, in his ſeventh Charge. If you make the Lord's Supper, as it was inſtituted by Chriſt, a mere commemoration, you make it a ſtrange and unintelligible rite: for what can be more[u] ſtrange than eating the fleſh and drinking the blood of one, who is to be regarded only as an inſtructor and benefactor? if we had been ordered, in the Sacrament, to kill an animal, and ſhed its blood; or only to break bread, and pour out wine; the rite would have been intelligible, as a ſimple memorial; it would have repreſented Chriſt's *Death*, merely *as* a death; but it would have been a *different* rite from ours. Now conceive it as a feaſt on a *ſacrifice*, and all is eaſy and ſimple. We indeed are not in the habit of ſacrificing; but what is that? who could not underſtand, that when ſacrifices were in uſe, part of the victim was ſerved up at a religious *feaſt*; and all who partook[x] of the material feaſt

[t] 2 Cor. xi. 3.—See Dr. Prieſtley's expreſſion before.

[u] Before, Sect. 1.—Dr. Balguy, page 309.

[x] See Potter's Antiquities, Vol. 1. page 145. which though about Heathens, is worth our notice. Heathens, deliberating about Chriſtianity, muſt have had their minds full of ideas of heathen ſacrifices. And theſe ideas muſt have affected both their converſion, and their Religion after converſion; beſides making it eaſier to them to conceive and celebrate the Chriſtian Sacrifice.

feaſt were underſtood to partake of the ſpiritual benefits of the ſacrifice[y]. Chriſt was our victim; on his body we do not feaſt literally, becauſe it is in Heaven; but he appointed bread to repreſent it; on that we can feaſt, and ſo partake of his Body; that is, feaſt upon the *victim*. Such bread is "*the Bread of Life*," becauſe, by his own appointment, it repreſents his *Fleſh*. This appears to me plain and *ſimple*.

XXXI. We muſt now take ſome notice how the Romaniſts prove *Tranſubſtantiation* from ſcripture. They have ſeveral weak arguments which, as I ſaid in the caſe of Purgatory and Invocation of Saints, it would be no Improvement to conſider. Such as John ii. 9. the tranſubſtantiating of water into wine; (it did not, after the change, *appear* to be water); and 1 Cor. xi. 29. not *diſcerning* the Lord's Body; by which St. Paul means, not making a religious meal of the Lord's Supper, but a profane one; and that with exceſs and intemperance, with violation of the rules of[z] *ſobriety*.—Their chief argument lies in the words, "*this is my*[a] *body*;" *plain* words, as they contend: Archdeacon Sharp rightly replies, yes, they are plain words, for they are a very *plain figure*[b]. Many exceptions may be taken

[y] 1 Cor. x. 18. "Are not they which eat of the *Sacrifices*, partakers of the *Altar?*"—Lardner, ſpeaking of food, ſays, (Works, Vol. 11. page 332.) "The Worſhipper, as well as the Prieſt, partook of the Altar, excepting in the caſe of whole burnt-offerings."

[z] Suppoſe a large room, many Chriſtians met; the rich making ſeparate little parties, having a good ſupper and good wines; (a feaſt on an Heathen ſacrifice was a jovial thing): the poor obliged to meſs as they could; feeling mortified and inſulted by thoſe, who ought to be as their *brethren*, and make with them one company, one party.—Small ſelect parties of great perſons in the midſt of numbers, generally mortify, if not made by ſome uſeful Rule.

[a] Matt. xxvi. 26.

[b] Sermon on the Sacrament, preached at York Cathedral.—Sect. XIX. of this Article.

taken to their being uſed in a literal ſenſe; but I ſhall content myſelf with the context. If the bread, in the hand of Chriſt, was literally his Body, what was the Cup? "This cup is the New[c] Teſtament in my blood."—Was the Cup a Teſtament? was the Cup in Chriſt's blood? And if we may not take words figuratively, was Chriſt really and literally a *Vine*[d] and a *Door*?—It ſeems odd, that the Papiſts ſhould inſiſt upon ſetting aſide metaphor here, and yet underſtand *Bread* metaphorically in John vi. 48. and 51.—For they do not allow that *Bread* is ever eaten in the Sacrament[e].

XXXII. Our Article affirms, that "the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not, by Chriſt's Ordinance, *reſerved*, *carried about*, *lifted up*, or *worſhipped*."—We might therefore have arguments to examine on theſe four points. But (beſides that they muſt all be built upon Tranſubſtantiation) I do not ſee any which are likely to detain us.—Something

[c] Luke xxii. 20.

[d] See Append. to Art. XI. Sect. XXVII.

[e] If I was a Papiſt I would ſay thus;—The paſſages in which Chriſtians are ordered to eat the Fleſh of Chriſt, are very ſtrong; they ſtrike, amaze, almoſt terrify; I cannot wonder when devout people think, that, in ſome way or other, they *ought* to eat Chriſt's Fleſh: they have no way of doing it but in the Sacrament, God muſt therefore contrive ſome way that they ſhall do it there: but how?—all things are poſſible with God: he could change the bread which we eat into Chriſt's Body; ſurely then he *does*: he would not command things impoſſible. Thus I might argue if I was a Papiſt: as a candid Proteſtant I add,—This hypotheſis might go down in an ignorant age; it might get aſſociated with religion in general; it might influence the whole praxis of Religion, and therefore might become very difficult to extirpate. There might be an appearance that it could not be removed without a total overthrow of a great religious eſtabliſhment; one ſplendid and opulent, nay, without total deſtruction of Chriſtian principles in thoſe who profeſſed it.

Something is ſaid by the *Rhemiſts*[f], of paying diſtinguiſhed *honours* to Chriſt's Body, and of doing officious things ſimilar to *ſpreading garments* in our Saviour's way, when he entered Jeruſalem in triumph: They alſo would make an application of thoſe paſſages in which *Chriſt* is ſaid to have been[g] *adored*, to the adoration of the *Hoſt*: But I ſee nothing urged by Romaniſts from *Scripture*, which relates to the peculiar nature of the elements in the Lord's Supper, after conſecration.

Here ends our Proof, direct and indirect.

XXXIII. In regard to *Application*, I will only obſerve, that, on this Article, there ſeems great room for *mutual conceſſions*. But we have been already led to enter into theſe, in what was ſaid of Queen Elizabeth, and in the explanation of the third paragraph. Queen Elizabeth ſeems to have followed a right plan, and *Melancthon*[h] ſeems to have had the ſame idea with her Miniſters.

What can[i] ſeem more deſperate, at firſt, than Dupin's inſiſting on its being ſtill profeſſed, "that the bread and wine are *really* changed into the Body and Blood of Chriſt?" Yet if that had been ſaid by a proteſtant, and perhaps put in a ſhape a little different, we ſhould have made no objection to it. Might not a Proteſtant Preacher, addreſſing that part of his congregation, who would attend the Communion, and exhorting them to pay due reverence to the ſacred elements, ſay, that he who ſhould eat of them *now*, would eat only ſimple

[f] Rhemiſts on Matt. xxi. 8.—Mark xi. 8.—1 Cor. xi. 29.

[g] Rhemiſts on Matt. ii. 11.—viii. 8.—Heb. i. 6.

[h] Moſheim, 8vo. Vol. 4. page 37. or Cent. 16. 3. 2. 1. 27.

[i] Biſhop Cleaver obſerves, that there are three notions of the Lord's Supper, all allowing to it "what our Church conſiders as eſſential to a Sacrament, an outward viſible ſign and an inward ſpiritual Grace."

ſimple *bread and wine*; but that he who received them properly after conſecration, would "*verily and indeed*[k]" receive "the Body and Blood of Chriſt?"

Ambroſe has a ſimilar expreſſion, which the Papiſts would have us take in their ſenſe, but I fully believe that it was meant in ours. I take it as I find it in the Trent[l] Catechiſm—"There is *bread* before the conſecration, but after the conſecration, the *Body* of Chriſt." Now, how could this be, if the Bread were not *changed* into Chriſt's Body? But ſuppoſe it was propoſed to Dr. Dupin to ſay thus? 'The Bread, after conſecration, is changed into what is *meant in Scripture* by, the *Body* of Chriſt:' who could refuſe his aſſent? and whoſe purpoſe would not this anſwer?—Something of this ſort might effect an agreement; but it is idle to uſe words, and, by limitations to take away their cuſtomary meaning. As words are arbitrary ſigns, they depend for their meaning on cuſtom wholly. What ſignifies talking of a *Body*, not preſent as to *Place*[m]?—That which is not preſent in ſuch a ſenſe as to occupy a place, is not Body, in human language. And ſo that which is without the qualities, or accidents[n], of ſubſtances, is no ſubſtance: *Man* has no idea of ſuch

[k] Catechiſm, of Church of England.

[l] Trent Cat. page 210; or Sect. 27.

P. S. I have looked into Ambroſe, Edit. Paris 1603.—The paſſage appears page 366. tom 2. in his 4th Book and 4th Chapter De Sacramentis. The Books and Chapters are very ſhort, and the ſtile very declamatory.—The ſubject of the Chapter is, Chriſtus eſt Auctor Sacramentorum; the paſſage is, Tu forte dicis: Meus panis eſt *uſitatus*. Sed panis iſte panis eſt *ante* verba Sacramentorum: ubi acceſſerit conſecratio, *de pane fit Caro Chriſti*.

[m] Trent Catech. page 218. or Sect. 43.—Locke, Hum. Und. 2. 13. 11.

[n] See Locke, Hum. Und. Book 2. Chap. 23. Sect. 2. & 4.

ſuch a thing: nor could the notion have been admitted in any but an ignorant age°.

° The Romaniſts are very *tender* about this, as one ſees by their care to exclude *ſenſe* from judging of tranſubſtantiation; and their cautions about explaining it, and inquiring into it. (Trent Cat. Sect. 39. 41.—alſo 24.) What right has any human being to ſet aſide the judgment of the *ſenſes?*

MVSEVM BRITANNICVM

ARTICLE XXIX.

OF THE WICKED, WHICH DO NOT EAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE USE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Wicked, and ſuch as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and viſibly preſs with their teeth, (as Saint Auguſtine ſaith,) the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Chriſt; yet in no wiſe are they partakers of Chriſt; but rather, to their condemnation, do eat and drink the ſign or ſacrament of ſo great a thing.

---

1. In the way of *Hiſtory*, we may obſerve, that people have always been much inclined to provide themſelves with Charms, Amulets, &c. in order to drive away evils. Often, to uſe a thing which was *ordinarily* efficacious, if rightly managed, as *mechanically* efficacious. Sometimes indeed things uſed as Charms, may ſeem to be no way naturally efficacious; but to uſe ſuch is the extreme of ſuperſtition; and ſuch things may originally have been eſteemed natural medicines. We have already mentioned, that people have taken home the water uſed in *Baptiſm*, and applied it to bodily *ſores*; in like manner, conſecrated bread[a] and wine have

[a] See Fulke in anſwering Rhemiſts on John vi. 58. where he mentions from Tertullian a ſuperſtitious woman keeping the Sacrament in a cheſt, to eat faſting.—Alſo Art. xxv. Sect. vii.

have been given to Infants, have been kept for medical purpoſes, and even buried with the dead[b]. *Heathens* and *Jews* have[c] run into ſimiliar ſuperſtitions. Such folly ought to be oppoſed; but our preſent Article was aimed chiefly at the Romaniſts; who are accuſed of ſaying, that the *mere receiving* of the Lord's Supper, merits *remiſſion* of ſins, *ex opere operato*, (tranſlated in the Article of 1552, anſwering to our twenty-fifth, "*Of the work wrought*,") that is, *mechanically*[d]; without any good diſpoſition of the communicant[e].—What was ſaid of Sacraments in general, at the cloſe of the twenty-fifth Article, is applied here to the Lord's Supper in particular. This Article is not in the ſet of 1552; from whence one may preſume, that the early Reformers did not think ſuch particular application neceſſary.

What the Romaniſts ſay of the efficacy of Sacraments in general, was ſtated under the twenty-fifth Article; what they ſay of the efficacy of the Euchariſt in particular, muſt be mentioned here. The Rhemiſh annotators ſay, "Ill men receive the Body and Blood of Chriſt, be they infidels or ill livers:" their anſwerer Fulke ſays, "Wicked men receive *not* the body and blood[f] of Chriſt."—But the Romaniſts have three ways of receiving. The firſt, *ſacramental*, the ſecond *ſpiritual*, and a third

[b] Bingham, 15. 4. 19.—It appears from 11. 5. 8. and 16. 5, 6. that care was taken to prevent ſuch follies.

[c] Potter ſpeaks of φαρμακα σωτηρια, Book 2. Chap. 18, or Vol. 1. page 353. Amulets, page 355.—The Jews had Phylacteries. Theſe are mentioned together in the Saxon Confeſſion, Syntagma, page 104.—Heathen and Chriſtian *Holy-water*; Middleton's Letter from Rome, page 136.

[d] Some author ſays, *magically*; but I do not recollect who.

[e] Saxon Confeſſion, page 103, Synt.

[f] See Rhemiſts on 1 Cor. xi. 27. and Fulke's anſwers on the ſame; and on John vi. 27.

third made up of theſe two *conjoined*[g].—They who receive only ſacramentally, only *eat* the conſecrated wafer, without due preparation or diſpoſition.—They who only receive after the ſecond manner, ſpiritually, do nothing but what we ſhould call *hearing* Maſs, or in the words of the Trent Catechiſm, eat the "heavenly bread *in deſire* and *wiſh*;" that is, as I underſtand, they do not eat it *at all*. But they who *both eat* the wafer, and eat it with a good *diſpoſition*, after ſacramental confeſſion, receive in the third way.

It is poſſible that our church, by *inſerting* this Article here, might intend it as an argument againſt *Tranſubſtantiation*, in the way of a reductio ad abſurdum; for if all who eat the conſecrated wafer eat Chriſt's Body, then mice and flies, any animals or inſects, eat Chriſt's Body, as much as the moſt pious Chriſtian.

Our Article might be aimed alſo at the *Lutherans*; becauſe according to the Doctrine of *Conſubſtantiation*, all receivers of the Lord's Supper, receive the Body of Chriſt: and Dr. Bennet[h] argues, that Archbiſhop Parker could not be a Lutheran, becauſe he ſubſcribed this Article; and that the reaſon why other Prelates did *not* ſign it, was, probably, becauſe they were Lutherans.—I do not, however, perceive anything in the Lutheran Confeſſions, which our Church would wiſh to oppoſe, as bringing on the ſame evils with the Romiſh Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; indeed I ſee nothing allied to the Romiſh Doctrine, either in the Confeſſion of Wittemberg, or in that of Augſburg. The Saxon Confeſſion calls it "portentoſum

[g] Trent Catechiſm, page 224, or Sect. 77, of Euchariſt.—The Council, Seſſ. 13. Cap. 8. Canon 8.

[h] Eſſay on the Articles, page 187.—Biſhops Geſt and Cheney did *not* ſign.

tentoſum errorem Monachorum."—Theſe are all the hiſtorical remarks which it ſeems neceſſary to make.

II. Nor need the *Explanation* be long.

The *title* ſounds more like *French* phraſeology than Engliſh. Le voilà *qui* vient, ſee he is *coming*. We ſhould commonly expreſs the meaning of the Title thus; 'Of the Wicked not really *eating* the Body of Chriſt.' The Latin is, De Manducatione Corporis Chriſti, et impios illud non manducare. The *Wine* is not mentioned; probably for the ſake of ſimplicity and perſpicuity[i].

The chief part of the Article is expreſſed in the words of *Auguſtin*, as a Father much venerated by the Romaniſts. The paſſage is in his twenty-ſixth Tract on St. John.—It is quoted at length by Bennet[k] and Welchman.

As all men are "wicked" in ſome degree, it may be proper to obſerve, that *worthineſs* is here oppoſed to the *opus operatum*, or the ſuppoſed *mechanical* effect of the Lord's Supper.—"The Wicked" who eat "to their condemnation,"—are the *decidedly* wicked, the abandoned, "ſuch as be void of a lively Faith." The meaning is, to *oppoſe* the notion, that a man eats the Body of Chriſt how wicked *ſoever* he be.—A lively, or living Faith was explained under the twelfth Article[l].

III. We have here but *one propoſition*. 'Chriſtians do not get the benefits annexed to what in Scripture, is called eating the Body of Chriſt, merely by partaking of the Lord's Supper.'

For

[i] Art. XXVIII. Sect. XX. the ſame.

[k] 1794. Mr. Porſon, page 229, calls this paſſage of Auguſtin *ſpurious*; that ſhould be inquired into.—It is in the Catholicus conſenſus prefixed to Syntagma, page 207.

[l] Art. XII. Sect. XIV. XXIV.

For Proof, I will only cite Hab. ii. 4. with the New Teſtament applications of it[m]; John vi. 35. 54. and 1 Cor. xi. 29. which laſt is alluded to in the Article; and 1 John i. 7. which intimates, that we muſt walk in the Light, before the Blood of Chriſt cleanſes us from Sin.

IV. Our *Application* may be confined to *mutual conceſſions*. And for theſe I think there is greater room in this Article than in any other. The diſpute between the Romaniſts and the Reformed is merely[n] *verbal*; I mean about the preſent Article as ſeparated from all others. They ſay, the Bread after conſecration, is the Body of Chriſt, even in *ſubſtance*; it follows, ſuppoſing this true, that *whoever* eats that ſubſtance, eats the Body of Chriſt; that is, it is not *deſecrated* by one mouth more than by another. We ſay, that the bread continues bread after conſecration, and therefore, that every receiver eats bread; but that he who does what the ſcripture requires, may be ſaid, in the prophetic, ſtrong, figurative language of Scripture, to *eat the Body* of Chriſt; as he eats what is appointed to repreſent that Body, and what the Scripture calls briefly that Body itſelf. — The Romaniſts, therefore, and we uſe a phraſe, eating the Body of Chriſt, in two different ſenſes; and we uſe this propoſition, '*The wicked eat Chriſt's Body*,' in two different ſenſes: conſequently to diſpute about its truth, is idle and childiſh. They too uſe it as a corollary from a propoſition which we think falſe, though we own the corollary to be rightly deduced. Now it muſt always be trifling to diſpute about ſuch a coroliary, as if it were an independent propoſition. — We both require *preparation* for

[m] Art. XIII. end of Section II.

[n] Might this be the reaſon why Cranmer made no Article on this ſubject?

for the Sacrament, indeed Romaniſts more than we; we both ſay, that unworthy receivers may draw *puniſhment* upon themſelves; we both quote the paſſage of *Auguſtin*[o] which is in our Article. In ſhort, we both mean; that the conſecrated Bread is not deſecrated by the unworthineſs of the Receiver; and that worthineſs is required in order to obtain *benefit*.

Dupin ſays[p], that the Body and blood of Chriſt "are truly and really received by *all*, though none but the *faithful* partake of any *benefit* from them." What can we diſpute here? The former part of his affirmation is true, upon his ſuppoſition, of Tranſubſtantiation; but that we think falſe; yet we might uſe the ſame *words*, with a different idea. The latter part agrees with our opinions. The former is the ſame thing as if he had ſaid, '*Suppoſing* Tranſubſtantiation, the Body and Blood of Chriſt are received by all communicants.' This could not be diſputed; why then ſhould not the Romaniſts now expreſs themſelves ſo, if it comes to the ſame thing? why ſhould we diſcuſs a doctrine an hundred times over, in an hundred conſequences deduced from it?

I am apt to think, we take the Romaniſts too ſtrictly about the Sacrament producing *Virtues*[q] or *Graces*: that which is to be *expected* of courſe, is ſpoken of, in human language, as a conſequence, and no uncertainty is expreſſed about it.—Luke xvii. 1.—1 Cor. xi. 19.—What Proteſtant teacher would ſcruple to tell his hearers that attending the Sacrament would *make* them better men? Our Homily[r] deſcribes the Graces and Virtues "*wrought*" (operatæ)

[o] Trent Catech. Sect. 57.—See alſo Sect. 58, 59.

[p] Third Append. to Moſheim.

[q] "An admirable and *ſure* virtue to cure our ſouls." From Trent Cat. page 145.

[r] On worthy receiving, page 350, 8vo.

(operatæ) by the Sacrament; and I have done the ſame in explaining[s] the expreſſion, "ſpiritual grace."—If the Romaniſts held what they are charged with, they muſt hold, that *all* perſons receive the *ſame* benefit from the ſame Sacrament.—But this is contrary to many paſſages of the Trent Catechiſm[t].

v. I ſhall *conclude* what I have to obſerve on this Article, by reading Dr. *Balguy's*[u] account of our obligation to *prepare* ourſelves for the worthy receiving of the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. And may that ſcripture comfort the feeble-minded, which ſays, that we may truſt we have a good conſcience if we are in all things willing to live honeſtly.—Heb. xiii. 18.

[s] Art. xxv. Sect. 11.
[t] On the Euch. Sect. 51, &c. And 57, 58, 59.
[u] Charge 7th, page 315.

ARTICLE XXX.

OF BOTH KINDS.

THE Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Chriſt's ordinance and commandment, ought to be miniſtered to all Chriſtian men alike.

---

1. The principal part of the *Hiſtory* of this Article conſiſts in ſhewing, how the Romiſh cuſtom of not giving the cup to the Congregation aroſe from the Doctrine[a] of *Tranſubſtantiation*. When the ſacramental wine came to be conſidered as the *blood* of Chriſt in a literal ſenſe, and that in an age of weakneſs and ſuperſtition, though reverence for the elements ſeems to have been exceſſive *before*, men became ſeized with an *horrour* at the thoughts of any of it being profaned, loſt, dropped by the trembling hand, or even lodged upon the Beard. I think there are ſtories of ſome *judgments* coming upon individuals on account of ſuch profanation. —How to apply a remedy? At firſt the deſperate expedient of wholly withholding the Cup, did not occur; the bread was *ſopped* in the wine; the wine was conveyed into the mouth by means of *tubes*; ſtill, probably, accidents did not ceaſe; at length, the ordinance of Chriſt was maimed, through an exceſſive fear of ſpoiling a falſe ſhape, into

[a] Middleton's Letter from Rome, Pref. page lxxix.

into which it had been tortured:—the *Cup* was denied to the *People*; including ſuch *Prieſts* as, at any particular communion, made a part of the *congregation*. For a time, the authority of the ruling Eccleſiaſtics might be ſufficient to prevent the people from murmuring; but the practice was afterwards ſettled by the authority of a *Council*: the Council of *Conſtance*, begun ſo late as the year 1414: a very numerous one, as we have ſhewn[b] before.

II. That the ancient Fathers, and all before the twelfth Century, had no notion of ſuch a thing as preventing the people from receiving the Cup, appears ſufficiently from the gradual manner in which the ancient practice was left off. But their expreſſions are alſo plain, as taking for granted, and ſuppoſing that every man received both bread and wine[c]; and reprimanding thoſe who wanted to make a change.—The *Manicheans*, indeed, avoided *all* wine, on principle, and therefore avoided the *Cup*, when the liquor in the Cup was wine: at Rome, when they wiſhed to be concealed, they ſometimes were *diſcovered* by this declining of the cup[d].

III. The *Greek Church* has no cuſtom of refuſing the cup to the people[e]: the Roman cuſtom aroſe from the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation; which

[b] Art. XXI. Sect. II. from Fox I. 785. Seſſ. 13.—See Labbé's Councils, col. 100.—Baxter on Councils, page 437, has the Decree. As alſo has Biſhop Burnet on the Article.—See Comber's Advice, page 12. 17.

[c] See Burnet on the Article.—Bingham, 15. 5. 1.

[d] Leo I. in his Serm. 4. de Quadrageſimâ, quoted by *Lardner*, Works, Vol. 3. page 491.—Burnet mentions this, page 438. octavo.

[e] "The Laity, as well as the Prieſts, communicate in both kinds, taking the Bread and the Wine together in a ſpoon from the hand of the Prieſt." Paul Ricaut, page 187.

which I do not conceive to be *properly* a doctrine of the Greek Church: for although Sir Edwin Sandys ſays[f], the Greek Chriſtians do hold Tranſubſtantiation; yet that ſeems by no means a ſettled thing. From Sir Paul Ricaut's account I judge, that only thoſe Greek Chriſtians who have reſided in Italy have favoured it. The Patriarch Cyrill agreed wholly with the reformed Churches in this particular[g].

IV. As we might be ſuſpected of exaggeration if we gave our own account of the Romaniſts, we will let them ſpeak for themſelves.

The twenty-firſt Seſſion of the Council of Trent was upon the buſineſs of communion in one kind, ſomething being annexed about giving any kind of communion to *Infants*. The members of the Council do not ſay, that it is *wrong* for Chriſtians to receive in both kinds, only that it is *not neceſſary*:—they hold, that though the *primitive* manner was to receive in both kinds, the *Church* has power to alter it, as to anything but the ſubſtance of the inſtitution; making allowances for circumſtances, of time and place, &c.—and that the alteration in queſtion was made for *weighty* and *juſt cauſes*; but thoſe cauſes are not ſpecified.—It is however ſaid, in the way of argument, that Chriſt is received *whole* and intire under one kind; and therefore, that they to whom only one kind is adminiſtered, are defrauded of no *ſaving grace*, no beneficial effects.—But in the Council, two queſtions occurred.

1. Whether

[f] Speculum Europæ, page 233.

[g] Paul Ricaut, page 182.—There was, however, ſuch a term in the Greek Church as μετουσιωσις, coined on purpoſe to expreſs the notion which had been brought from Italy. Which might be uſed by ſome to expreſs the change made in the bread and wine by conſecration.

1. Whether the Church's weighty and juſt cauſes, were ſo ſtrong, that the uſe of the cup was to be allowed to no perſons whatſoever?

2. Suppoſing it might be allowed to ſome particular nation, whether it ſhould not be on *conditions*; and what thoſe conditions ſhould be? — theſe queſtions were left undecided till the next Seſſion; and then they were left by the Council, to[h] the deciſion of the *Pope*.

The *Trent Catechiſm*[i] directs the People to be taught, "That by the Law of the Church it is *prohibited* that any one, without the Authority of the Church, (except conſecrating Miniſters) ſhould take the ſacred Euchariſt in both kinds." Some authorities of ancient *Fathers* are quoted; and *ſix reaſons* are ſpecified.

1. The fear of ſpilling.

2. The fear of wine growing ſour, when kept for the ſick.

3. The *diſlike* which ſome perſons have for the taſte or ſmell of wine.

4. The fear of hurting the *health* of the communicants.

5. The *ſcarcity* of wine in ſome places.

6. Laſtly and principally, the deſire of oppoſing thoſe *Heretics*, who *diſhonour* Chriſt by ſaying, that he cannot be received *intire* under one kind: that being to deny his *Divinity*. It is added, that ſuch as have treated on this argument have aſſigned ſtill more reaſons.

The *Rhemiſts*, on[k] John vi. 58. ſay, that the Church has only regulated manner, order, and particular points; (that is, has not hurt the ſubſtance or *eſſence* of the Sacrament;) that ſuch regulations the

[h] See end of 22d Seſſion.—Voltaire, Vol. 10. quarto, page 160.

[i] Sect 70, &c.

[k] Fulke's Rhem. Teſt. opp. fol. 152. on John vi. 58.

the Church has authority to make, according to time and place, for the honour of God, reverence to the Sacrament, and profit to the people: (edifying).—Then they mention ſome of the ſame Fathers which are referred to in the Catechiſm: and ſome of the ſame reaſons; aſſigning moreover the *number* of communicants; a "*dreadful regard*" of "Chriſt's *own blood*;" and the practice of ſome centuries.—To their authorities from the Fathers, and indeed to their arguments, Dr. Fulke ſeems to me to have given a complete anſwer.

Though the *language* of the *Council* ſeems to imply an opening for variety and *liberty*, yet the conſtant practice of the Church of Rome has been, for no one to receive the cup except the conſecrating Prieſt[l].

In later times, with a view to agreement, *Dupin*[m] declares for mutual toleration in this point; and for leaving it to be ſettled by *each Church* for itſelf.

v. One would think, that the practice of adminiſtering to the people in only one kind, might have been *deduced* from the *Lutheran* Conſubſtantiation; but the Confeſſion of *Wittemberg*[n] (which I have preſumed to be the work of Luther,) expreſsly diſclaims the deduction. And all other reformed churches ſeem to oppoſe it.

vi. The Neceſſary Doctrine is not reformed with regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.—It ſays, that the Cup is *not neceſſary* to *Salvation*. That receiving in one or both kinds, rather concerns

[l] Dr. Prieſtley (Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2. page 55, from Hiſtoire des Papes, Vol. 4. page 679.) ſays, that "Pius IV. granted the Communion in both kinds to thoſe who ſhould demand it, provided they profeſſed to believe as the Church did in other reſpects. The Bohemians alſo were allowed, with the Pope's conſent, to make uſe of the Cup."

[m] As before.—Third Appendix to Moſheim.

[n] Syntagma, page 160.

concerns the *manner* or faſhion of the Sacrament than the *eſſence*; that the main thing is *worthineſs*: —by "ancient cuſtom" I ſuppoſe it means the ſame as the Rhemiſts by, "ſome" centuries. In a popular calculation a cuſtom of ſome hundred years ſtanding, is an[o] ancient one.—It contends, that "by natural *reaſon*," "the *lively* body cannot be without *blood*."

Archbiſhop Cranmer is ſaid to have been the Author of this Neceſſary Doctrine[p], &c.—it muſt have gone hard with him to exclude the Cup, in compoſing it; for in the firſt year of Edward VI. the adminiſtration in both kinds was voted, nullo reclamante, in a Convocation where he had probably the chief weight[q].—This makes me wonder why our preſent Article was not amongſt thoſe of 1552. Neither do I ſee the ſubject in the Reformatio Legum.—I cannot account for theſe omiſſions.

P. S. The *Article* of Edward VI. confirming his very recent *Liturgy*, made in 1552, takes in this particular; — this was to be ſubſcribed.

VII. I do not ſee that this Article wants any *explanation*. "Is not to be *denied*"—ſeems to anſwer to the expreſſion of the Council of Trent, "*petentibus* uſum[r] calicis."

But if it was ſaid, that the Cup is not to be denied to thoſe who *aſk* it, would not that imply, that

[o] Sterne's ſimple and unſcholaſtic Uncle has no idea of any event having happened above 100 years ago.

[p] Oxford Pamph. on 17th Art. page 32, from Burnet.—Hiſt. Ref. Vol. 2.—Records, page 238. Where Henry VIII. calls it Cranmer's own Book.

[q] Wheatly, page 25. from Strype's Cranmer, page 157, 158. It appears, page 156, that Archbiſhop Cranmer *introduced* the propoſal of having both kinds, at this Convocation, and that they were ſupported by Archdeacon Cranmer, his brother.

[r] Trent, page 152. or Seſſ. 22. at the end.

that withholding the Cup from ſuch as did *not* aſk it, is innocent?

VIII. We may proceed therefore to ſome *Proof*.

I ſee but one Propoſition in the Article; namely,

'By the Ordinance of Chriſt, both Bread and Wine are to be adminiſtered, in the Lord's Supper.'

Matt. xxvi. 27.—"Drink ye *all* of it."

Matt. xxvi. 28.—*All* Chriſtians are in the new *Covenant*; and all ſtand in need of "remiſſion of ſins."—Theſe are aſſigned as reaſons for all drinking of the Cup: "*For* this," &c.

1 Cor. xi. 26—28. is addreſſed to all the Church of Corinth.

1 Cor. xii. 13. puts *Baptiſm* and the *Lord's Supper* on one and the ſame footing; and for the Lord's Supper uſes the term[s] *drinking*: that part for the whole. If the Romaniſts ſay *either* part is, according to them, ſufficient, yet all objections to the Cup in particular, are here done away. Dr. Middleton obſerves, with a view to our preſent ſubject, that the abſurdities into which the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation leads, ſhould make it to be diſtruſted[t].

IX. The Romaniſts offer ſo many arguments, that we muſt have ſome *indirect* proof.—We may obſerve of them, in general, that they prove *too much*; and therefore nothing at all.—Before we mention them, be it obſerved, that our Saviour, in the Inſtitution of the ſacrament of the Lord's Supper, makes *no difference* between the Bread and the Wine; of any kind, that I ſee.—Alſo, that the Romiſh doctrine is this;—the *Prieſt* who conſecrates, muſt *conſecrate* both bread and wine; and muſt

[s] Locke on 1 Cor. xii. 13.

[t] Pref. to Letter from Rome, page lxxx.

muſt *receive* both himſelf; though he muſt *adminiſter* only Bread.

X. Chriſt at Emmaus[u] only *broke bread*; now if he gave the *Sacrament*, and bread does not imply wine, then the argument proves too much: it proves, that the Prieſt ought to *conſecrate* only bread.—And this applies to all arguments founded on the phraſe, breaking of bread.

Though a *name* of anything conſiſting of parts, may be taken from either part, and though St. Paul takes his name for the Sacrament, on one occaſion, from *drinking* (1 Cor. xii. 13.), yet whoever paints to himſelf the nature of the Inſtitution, muſt think, that breaking of bread is another obvious and natural name for the whole ceremony: eſpecially as it was a name for *any repaſt*.

The *Quakers*[x] (and indeed many of our communion) hold, that breaking of bread does *not* mean the Sacrament;—in ſome caſes it may not, being the name for any meal, but in ſome caſes I think, it does; as where it is joined with *doctrine*[y] and *prayer*; or mentioned as the employment *for which* the Apoſtles met on a *Lord's Day*[z].—*Barclay* argues againſt this, from *eating* being joined with breaking[a] of bread, and from the company continuing till *midnight*[b], or later; but why might not this *eating* be the Αγαπη? which uſed to be (ſometimes at leaſt) held in the evening? I can conceive any conferences of Chriſtian leaders in St. Paul's time, whether begun by an Αγαπη, or not, to continue for a part of the night or the whole night.—But to return.

XI. The Romaniſts ſay, the *Apoſtles* indeed were to drink of the wine, but they were made *Prieſts*.

[u] Luke xxiv. 30. 35.
[x] See Barclay's Apology, Prop. 13. Sect. 8.
[y] Acts ii. 42.
[z] Acts xx. 7.
[a] Acts ii. 46.
[b] Acts xx. 7. 11.

Prieſts. This again proves *too much*.—For granting the argument, it follows, that *wine* ought to be adminiſtered *to all Prieſts*. And the Laity are under no obligation to receive the Bread; for there is *no difference* in our Saviour's appointment of bread and wine.

XII. It is urged, Chriſt is received intire in his body; every *Body* contains *blood*. We once ſpoke againſt *inferences* in unintelligible doctrines[c]. This goes to prove, that it was abſurd in Chriſt to inſtitute the Cup; and that it is equally ſo in the conſecrating Prieſt to drink it.—By the way, this argument is a conſequence of Tranſubſtantiation; which we conſider ourſelves as having diſproved.

XIII. But, ſay the Romaniſts, the *Prieſt* receives the Cup in order to "*expreſs* lively the paſſion of Chriſt, and the ſeparation of his blood from[d] his body, in the ſame." But this goes to prove that *all* Chriſtians ought to receive the cup; as they are all to ſhew the Lord's *Death* till he come.

XIV. But giving the people the cup, occaſions *diſhonour* to the blood of Chriſt, occaſions its being *ſpilt*, &c.—another corollary from Tranſubſtantiation: but moreover it proves *too much*. It proves, that Chriſt could not *foreſee* theſe great evils; he muſt have forborn to inſtitute anything which true wiſdom would *wholly* remove in order to avoid them. Nay, theſe evils were not peculiar to diſtant ages; they muſt be liable to happen *every time* the wine was conſecrated, in every age. Perhaps an Heretic might be ſo profane as to ſay, what real harm could be done by a drop even of the *real blood* of Chriſt falling to the ground? or what real diſhonour? his blood muſt have fallen to the ground when he was alive. Chriſt is honoured moſt by a faithful

[c] Art. 1. Sect. XVIII.

[d] Rhemiſts on John vi. 58.

faithful and pious heart; a man may have that with a *trembling hand*. And as to any corporeal *pain*, or ſuffering, on account of what fell, that muſt be out of the queſtion: the *falling* of blood never occaſions pain to the perſon by whom it is ſhed.

XV. But giving the cup, or witholding it, is only *manner*, form, faſhion; not the ſubſtance or *eſſence* of the Sacrament. This again proves *too much*. For as Chriſt made no difference, if the cup be not the eſſence, neither is the *bread*.—Therefore, again, the people are under no obligation to receive the bread. – But indeed the manner of inſtituting the cup has no appearance of mere variable mode and circumſtance. And if any change is to be made in an ordinance on account of change of circumſtances, it ſhould be ſhewn, that thoſe new circumſtances are not voluntary corruptions and abuſes.

XVI. But enough. I will trouble you with *no more* arguments; neither does it ſeem neceſſary to make any *Application* of our reaſonings on the preſent Article.—Biſhop Porteus's Chapter on this ſubject is well executed.

ARTICLE XXXI.

OF THE ONE OBLATION OF CHRIST FINISHED UPON THE CROSS.

THE Offering of Chriſt once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and ſatisfaction for all the ſins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other ſatisfaction for ſin, but that alone. Wherefore the ſacrifice of Maſſes, in the which it was commonly ſaid, that the Prieſt did offer Chriſt for the quick and the dead, to have remiſſion of pain or guilt, were blaſphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.

---

1. The ſubject of this Article is the Romiſh *Maſs*.

We will begin, as uſual, with a few *hiſtorical* obſervations; but as there may be ſome who have not attended ſo much to Romiſh Doctrines as to have a clear idea of what is meant by the Romiſh Maſs, it may be proper, previouſly, to give ſome account of it.

The Proteſtant notion of the Lord's Supper has been explained; all that ſome Proteſtants do, is to commemorate the Death of Chriſt; others join in a ceremony which may repreſent a *Feaſt* on a ſacrifice; that is, thoſe who conſider the Death of Chriſt as a *ſacrifice*. The fartheſt any Proteſtant goes,

goes, is to *offer* a ſymbolical *commemorative*[a] ſacrifice.—But *Romaniſts*, by conſecrating bread, make it, in their opinion, the *real Body* of Chriſt, and they uſe it in two different ways; they not only adminiſter it as a *Sacrament*, but they *offer* it up to God the Father as a real *Sacrifice:* they have one Form for offering up the bread, another for offering up the conſecrated[b] cup.—The ſacrifice here offered, is not ſaid to be ſymbolical, but a real, literal, *propitiatory* ſacrifice.—There is one form which requeſts Chriſt to[c] deliver and aſſiſt the ſuppliant by *the Body of Chriſt* juſt received.

What was ſaid of ſome Romiſh Doctrines at the opening of the twenty-ſecond Article, and ſince of others, ſeems fully applicable to the Doctrine of the *Maſs*.

The Romaniſts have a *ſyſtem* of notions to ſupport this of offering the conſecrated bread as the Body of Chriſt; it ſeems intended to obviate *objections*. But this will appear when we look into their writings, by and by.

All thoſe maſſes in which the Congregation are *Spectators*, and the Prieſt *alone* receives the elements, may be called *ſolitary*, in ſome ſenſe; but thoſe, I think, are properly ſolitary maſſes, at which no one but the Prieſt[d] is *preſent*. *Several* of theſe may be going on in the ſame church, at different Altars, at the ſame[e] time. Theſe are generally intended

[a] See Heylin's Life of Laud, page 21.—Biſhop Cleaver's two Sermons, page 2. 18.

[b] Préſent Spirituel, page 35. [c] Ibid. page 53.

[d] Card. *Bona* ſeems to call *both ſorts* private. "Sive enim dicatur *privata* ex eo quòd *ſolus* Sacerdos in eâ communicet; ſive quia vel unus duntaxàt vel pauci ei *interſint*," &c. Bona Rerum liturgicarum, 1. 14. 1.

[e] There are ſome which are called *dry Maſſes*; mere outward ſhew, without Conſecration, &c. but theſe and others being blamed

intended to deliver departed *Souls* out of *Purgatory:* and are *paid* for; inſomuch that ſome Prieſts are ſaid to get their *living* by offering up Chriſt a great number of times in a day.—Indeed in public maſſes there are ſome parts which are not audible, called in French *La*[f] *Secrete*, and in all, or moſt, I ſuppoſe, there are ſome prayers for the *dead*.

This cuſtom of ſaying Maſs prevails ſo much as to exclude[g], in a manner, all *other worſhip*.

This is the *ſtate* of that Romiſh practice of which we ſhould now attempt to give ſome *hiſtorical* account.

11. The only *queſtions* are, when did this practice *begin*? and what *variations* has it been ſubject to? It may be difficult to aſſign for its commencement any period with preciſion. The Maſs, in the ſtricteſt ſenſe, could not begin before the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation exiſted, becauſe it proceeds upon that doctrine. — But ſomething which *ſounds* like it, and *approached* to it, and would in effect bring it on, may be found before. It is difficult to trace out facts nicely in dark and and ignorant ages, but the name of *Sacrifice* for different parts of divine *worſhip*, has been long in uſe[h].

The

blamed by *Bona*, &c. as abuſes, I do not mention them. *Nautical* Maſſes are without wine, for fear the motion of the ſhip ſhould ſhake it ſo much as to ſpill it.—See theſe and others mentioned, Bingham, 15. 4. 5.

[f] Préſent Spir. page 38.—*Oraiſon* ſecrete, or ſometimes La Secrete, as a ſubſtantive. Dict. Acad.

[g] Rhemiſts on Luke xxii. 20.

[h] In ſcripture, *Beneficence* is called a ſacrifice, Heb. xiii. 16, we have alſo the ſacrifice of *praiſe*, Heb. xiii 15. the *Body* of Man is to be a living (ſometimes in old Engliſh called *lively*) ſacrifice, Rom. xii. 1.—And when the captive Jews could offer no ſacrifices, their devotions were called the *Calves* of their lips.

The ancient Fathers expreſſed themſelves warmly, and nobly; the ſame feelings, which made them give dignity to every ſacred ordinance by ceremonies and habits, made them cloath their expreſſions of things ſacred, with ſplendid metaphors.—And if they called the Evening *prayer* their evening ſacrifice[i], no wonder they gave the name of ſacrifice to that ordinance[k], which they conſidered as a repreſentation of the ſublime and affecting ſacrifice of Chriſt himſelf. If one wanted to ſee a number of inſtances, one might conſult the Rhemiſh Teſtament on 1 Cor. x. 21. and Dr. Fulke's anſwer: but I can ſelect no better ſingle paſſage than that which is attributed to Ambroſe, on Heb. x. 11. though the ſame[l] is found in Chryſoſtom. The phraſe, *unbloody ſacrifice*, has alſo been uſed by the Fathers for the Lord's Supper, and adopted by the Romaniſts for their ſacrifice of the Maſs.—*Miſſa* is itſelf an[m] ancient word. *Oblations*, of one ſort or other, are very ancient, and ſo is the cuſtom of dedicating or offering them up to God at the *Altar*.—Now ſuppoſe a Prieſt, in an age of ignorance and ſuperſtition, heated with zeal and piety, to get all things ſtrongly into his mind, and to fancy he had Chriſt in his hand; may we not conceive, that he might begin the cuſtom of offering him up to God the Father?

To carry our attempts farther, in accounting for the Maſs, would not probably anſwer any good purpoſe;—only we may add, that the idea of profiting

[i] Pſalm cxli. 2.—Bingham, 13. 1. 5.

[k] See Prieſtley's Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2. page 6.—Bingham, 2. 20. 8. *Sacrificii* opus ſine Preſbytero eſſe non potuit, from Hil. Fragm. page 129.—See Heylin's Laud, page 21.

[l] Rhem. Teſt. on Heb. x. 11. and Fulke.

[m] See Art. XXVIII. Sect. 11.—Fulke thinks, that *Miſſa* is not ſo ancient as the time of *Ambroſe*.—On Rhem. Teſt. opp. page 280.—On 1 Cor. x. 21.

profiting particular people (and the Prieſt of courſe) by particular offerings, made at the Lord's table, or altar, on their behalf, with the conſecration uſed at the communion, ſeems to have been carried into execution before[n] the tenth Century, the æra of Tranſubſtantiation: though ſuch offerings were more properly *ſacraments* than *Sacrifices*.—They were accounted *abuſes*, and *Laws* were made againſt them.—*Prayers* for the *dead* were in uſe in the time of *Chryſoſtom*, and were offered at the *time*[o] of celebrating the Lord's Supper.—A weakneſs not unnatural, but, as it now ſeems to us, injudicious: yet there might be difficulty in ſeeing, at that time, that it could be attended with much harm.

It may be proper to remark here, that though the Fathers ſometimes uſed expreſſions which *ſounded* like thoſe of the later Romaniſts, yet that ſuch expreſſions were *declamatory*, and are not to be underſtood in a proper or literal ſenſe.—The very ancient Fathers, having occaſion to ſpeak againſt the heathen ſacrifices, and ſpeaking literally, declared, in their Apologies, that Chriſtians had *none*. And in the moſt declamatory ſentences, ſomething always appears, from which it is evident, that the expreſſions are not intended as plain or literal.—*Gratian*, who lived about the middle of the twelfth Century[p], undertook to reconcile Canons, &c. and expreſſions of Fathers ſeemingly diſcordant; on the words, *Hoc eſt*, he obſerves, "therefore as the Heavenly bread, which is the Fleſh of Chriſt, is *called*, after the proper manner thereof, the *Body* of Chriſt, when in deed and *truth*

[n] Bingham, 15. 4. 4.—Moſheim, Cent. 8. 2. 4.

[o] Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. opp. 279 or on 1 Cor. x. 21.—Prieſtley's Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2. page 11. is near this purpoſe.

[p] Cave places him A. D. 1131.

truth it is the *Sacrament* of the Body of Chriſt," &c.—and afterwards, " not in the *truth* of the *thing*, but in a *ſignifying myſtery*," &c[q].

And the *unbloody ſacrifice* of the ancients, was only figurative; it meant, the repreſentation of the real ſacrifice of Chriſt, in which he ſhed his *blood* for Mankind.—Indeed I do not ſee how the ſacrifice of the Romiſh Maſs can be called *unbloody*, as the blood of Chriſt, or what they call ſo, is ſolemnly offered up.

III. When once the practice of ſacrificing in the Maſs was ſettled, I do not know that there was much *variation* in it. Some abuſes crept in, from avarice, irreverence and ſuperſtition. This we learn from the Council of Trent, which makes a Decree for reforming[r] them.

We may now ſee what the Acts and the Catechiſm of that Council tell us concerning our preſent ſubject.—The *Council* held their twenty-ſecond Seſſion September 22, 1562; ten years after King Edward's Articles were made, and therefore may well be ſuppoſed acquainted with their contents.—They lay down, that Chriſt ſuperſeded the *Jewiſh* Prieſthood, which was to be temporary, by his own, which was to be perpetual. Yet though he was a Prieſt for ever, he did not mean that *earthly* Prieſthood ſhould ceaſe: accordingly, the night before he was betrayed, he *offered up*, to his heavenly Father, *his Body* and blood, under the *ſymbols* of Bread and Wine, and *ordained* his diſciples *Prieſts*, that they (and their ſucceſſors) might afterwards *offer him up*. Still there was to be but *one Prieſt*, the Apoſtles acting only for their Lord. —The appointed ſacrifice was to repreſent the original

[q] *Gratian*, Concord: diſcord. Diſtinction 2. C. Hoc eſt.—For this *Engliſh*, ſee Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. 1 Cor. x. 20.

[r] Seſſ. 22d. firſt Decree. (page 145, Latin.)

original one; both being real, but the former *bloody*, the latter *unbloody:* yet the appointed was to be accounted *one* and *the ſame* with the original one, differing only in the *mode* of offering; ſtrictly propitiatory, capable of gaining remiſſion of even great ſins; and therefore to be offered for the *dead* as well as the living.

The *Catechiſm* keeps pretty cloſe to the Council: in deſcribing the difference between a Sacrament and a Sacrifice, it ſays, "The ſacred Euchariſt whilſt it is kept in the *Pyx*[s], or carried to the ſick, has not the nature of a Sacrifice, but of a *Sacrament:*" but when it is *both*, "they that offer this ſacrifice, wherein they communicate with us, do *ſatisfy* and *merit* the fruits of our Lord's Paſſion." —And afterwards it is[t] ſaid, "*We* ſacrifice," that is, all communicants. Maſſes for the *Dead* are[u] built on *Tradition:*—and no maſſes are to be called *private*; becauſe all pertain to the Salvation of all the faithful.

The Rhemiſts have a great deal to ſay, but nothing that I need trouble you with

IV. *Wickliffe* had not, probably, at once ſettled his principles ſo as to appear perfectly *uniform* in his opinions, in all parts of his works; but a propoſition condemned as his in the Council of Conſtance was the following[x]; — "The Goſpel ſaith not that Chriſt inſtituted the Maſs."

The *Reformed* Churches ſeem all againſt the Romiſh Maſs: the Confeſſion of *Augſburg* ſpeaks favourably of the *term* Maſs, and *exculpates* itſelf from the charge of having *aboliſhed*[y] that rite.—

The

[s] Sect. 78. [t] Sect. 85. [u] Sect. 86.

[x] See Baxter on Councils, Chap. 13. or page 431.—See alſo Fox's Acts, &c. (or Martyrol.) Index, *Wickliffe*.

[y] Biſhop *Andrews* was candid alſo: ſee Heylin's Life of Laud, page 21.

The *Lutherans* departed the leaſt from the Romiſh Church.

One of the *ſix articles* is, "That private Maſſes ought to be continued, which as it is agreeable to God's Law, ſo men receive great benefit from them."

The Neceſſary Doctrine, gives inſtructions with regard to the *Sacrament* of the Altar, but I ſee nothing about *Sacrifice*. It concludes with a ſhort Lecture on praying for the *dead*, in which it diſcourages every way of being *particular*, if I may ſo ſpeak.—It allows benevolent interceſſions for departed Chriſtians in general, on the principle of a "Communion of Saints," but oppoſes Maſſes being ſaid at particular *places* (at *Scala Cæli*), &c. —and rejects *purgatory*, blames all temerarious *judgment*, and would have all things in which we have not clear knowledge, left to the diſpoſal of God.

Perhaps Henry VIII. ſuffered Cranmer to undermine the *Maſs*, becauſe the cuſtom of ſaying Maſſes had a tendency to ſupport the power of the *Pope*.

In the beginning of the reign of Edward VI. Maſſes were left much the ſame as before, only the communion was allowed to the people in *both*[z] *kinds*. But in 1550 the Maſs-books were called in, and the *Altars* removed and changed into *Tables*: the principal Engliſh Reformers judging, that the retaining of altars would give offence to the chief enemies of Popery, and tend to keep up amongſt the people, the idea of a propitiatory[a] Maſs.—Some Biſhops refuſed to part with their altars, and were deprived for contumacy; the *Lutherans* did retain

[z] Neal's Hiſt. Pur. Vol. 1. quarto, page 36.
[a] Neal, page 44. ibid.

retain theirs[b]. There is a chapter againſt Maſſes in the *Reformatio Legum*.—And *Latimer*, in his Sermons[c], ſpeaks of them as they deſerve.

Of men's notions of the Maſs under *Elizabeth*, we may judge from the ſecond Book of Homilies; in which I do not recollect any laboured arguments, but only ſome ſhort declamatory expreſſions. It is called "*dumb* maſſing,"—"*mummiſh* maſſing." We are cautioned to take heed leſt the Lord's ſupper, "of the *memory*," "be made a *ſacrifice*;" "leſt applying it for the *dead*, *we* loſe the fruit that be alive."—We are told, that at it "every one of us muſt be gueſts and not gazers; eaters and not lookers, feeding ourſelves, not hiring others to feed for us," &c.—The Maſs, I ſuppoſe, was ſo far unſettled by this time, that arguments were unneceſſary, and eloquence ſufficient.—Yet it might be worth while for any curious perſon to compare ſome of the expreſſions in our communion-office, about the Body and Blood of Chriſt, about Chriſt's being a ſacrifice, &c. with the Romiſh Latin Forms; as he would the more eaſily conceive how the ſame expreſſions might ſuit the different Religions when taken in a literal[d] and metaphorical ſenſe.

Dupin is[e] unyielding as to our preſent Article: indeed he could change nothing without bringing the whole *Fabric* of Popiſh Worſhip upon his head. He maintains "that the Sacrifice of Chriſt is not only commemorated, but *continued* in the Euchariſt, and that every communicant offers him along with the Prieſt."

Cardinal

[b] On this ſubject, ſee Wheatly on the Common Prayer, page 273. octavo.—Heylin's Life of Laud, page 20.

[c] Vol. 1. octavo, page 162.—See alſo Index, Maſs.

[d] Art. XXVIII. Sect. XXXIII.—Art. XXIX. Sect. IV.—Heylin's Life of Laud, page 21.

[e] Moſheim, 3d Appendix.

Cardinal Bona[f] ſeems to be the moſt able Romiſh writer in defence of the Maſs, that I have happened to conſult.

v. We ſhould ſay ſomething of thoſe who think, that our Church did not recede far enough from the Church of Rome. We may call them collectively *Puritans*, or *Diſſenters*. But we have already[g] mentioned the modern cuſtom of *ſitting* at the Euchariſt unknown in the ancient Church:— To theſe an *Altar*[h] muſt be abomination, eſpecially the Romiſh ſort, of *ſtone*[i], ſet againſt a wall. *Lardner*[k] ſays, that near the primitive times, the Euchariſt was never ſaid to be upon an Altar.— One may eaſily conceive the *Croſs* to be called an Altar. Some have thought[l], that the Apoſtles would not be in the uſual familiar table-poſture, at the laſt ſupper, when they received the bread and wine. Whatever might be the caſe, our *kneeling* at the communion is juſtified, by our being in a continued act of *Devotion*; and by our conſidering the Ordinance as totally emblematical, or ſymbolical.—Our church, by a Rubric, guards againſt any ſuſpicion of our *adoring* the conſecrated elements: No Engliſh communicant has now ever any ſuch idea in his mind. And farther, we never inſiſt upon the poſture of kneeling as neceſſary for all ſocieties of Chriſtians. We are ſatisfied with our common expreſſion, *Altar-table*, as it ſeems to ſuit our idea, that the Euchariſt is moſt properly a repreſentation of a *Feaſt* upon a *Sacrifice*.

vi. We

[f] Rerum Liturgicarum Lib. and De Miſsâ.
[g] Art. XXVIII. Sect. XII.
[h] Secker's Sermons, Vol. 6. page 288.
[i] Fulke's Rhem. Teſt. Fol. 287. bottom.
[k] Works, Vol. 4. page 337.
[l] See Secker's Lectures, Lect. 36. page 243. "a *ſerious* and *devout* manner." More in Secker's Sermons, Vol. 6. page 288.

VI. We will now proceed to ſome *Explanation*. In the *Title*, *Oblation* means, I think, the ſame as *ſacrifice*: all ſacrifices were oblations, and all oblations were ſuppoſed to be accepted as ſacrifices. Under the Law of Moſes, the poorer ſort of men brought offerings, who could not afford ſacrifices. In our prayer of conſecration, ſacrifice and oblation come together, and ſeemingly as ſynonymous. —*One* oblation is oppoſed to the continued ſacrifices of the Romaniſts:—*finiſhed* is alſo oppoſed to perpetuated: and *on the Croſs*,—to, on the *Altar*.

VII. "The Offering"—in the Latin Oblatio; ſo the Engliſh might have been again, *Oblation*: but the firſt ſentence of the Article is not our preſent concern: it is only introductory, except indeed as it may ſuggeſt proofs: but the ſubject, of Chriſt's death being a Sacrifice, has been treated in the *Appendix* to the eleventh Article: I do not know that it was proved there that "there is none other," &c. but it is agreed that there can be no other, except what is afterwards mentioned in this Article.

VIII. "The Sacrifice of Maſſes," &c. "were," &c. this does not ſeem good grammar; but the Latin has Sacrificia, and the Engliſh, in Sparrow's collection, Sacrifices. Bennet, however, mentions, Sacrifice, as one reading. "Maſſes"—*Miſſa* has occurred[m] before: no diſtinction here between public and private maſſes.—"It *was* commonly ſaid,"—that is, before the Reformation:—I think we have had a ſimilar expreſſion before.—"*Pain*," in Latin *pæna*, which may ſignify *penalty*, or puniſhment. There is "*pænis*" in Trent Seſſion 22. Canon 3, relating to the ſame thing.

"*Blaſphemous*

[m] Art. XXVIII. Sect. II.—Art. XXXI. Sect. II.

"*Blaſphemous fables*," *figmenta*[n]: — "*dangerous deceits*,"—pernicioſæ *impoſturæ*. Other Reformed Churches uſe expreſſions much the ſame; which are anathematized by the Council of Trent[o] — How the ſacrifices of Maſſes have been "blaſphemous fables and dangerous deceits," will beſt be mentioned under our Proof.

IX. In entering on our *Proof*, we muſt ſettle what *Propoſitions* our Article gives us to prove. I ſee only *two*.

1. Maſſes, according to the Romiſh practice, are "blaſphemous Fables," or figmenta.

2. They are "dangerous deceits."

X. Being *fables*, figments, and deceits, ſeems to mean only one thing, namely, that they are *contrary to ſcripture*, or, at leaſt, unſupported by it.

This might ſufficiently appear from conſidering, that the doctrine of the Romiſh *Maſs* is founded upon that of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which we ſuppoſe ourſelves to have removed out of the way. But there are ſome texts which are ſo ſtrikingly oppoſed to the Maſs, that it muſt be worth while to cite them.

Thoſe which were cited in the Appendix to the eleventh Article, to prove Chriſt's death a Sacrifice, would ſhew, that ſuch ſacrifice was *completed*. But I will confine myſelf. Firſt I will take Heb. ix. 24. and go to the end of that Chapter. Is it poſſible to conceive, that the Apoſtle could have reaſoned thus, and have given no hint about the millions of ſacrifices which the Romiſh Prieſts profeſs to have performed? or is it poſſible to conceive, that any part of worſhip ſhould be meant to ſwallow

[n] Terence has, Fabulæ! for idle tales! ſtuff! Heauton: Act 2. Scen. 3. v. 95.

[o] Seſſ. 22. Canons 4 and 5.

ſwallow up all other parts, and yet no injunction be given about it? – Next read Heb. x. 26[p].—I do not ſee how it is any argument if there is any ſacrifice after that of Chriſt: as to all the ſacrifices of the Maſs, and the ſacrifice of Chriſt making but *one*, that ſeems quite a gratis dictum, and no argument.—Heb. v. 3. compared with vii. 24—28. ſhews, that no man can be a Prieſt in the room of Chriſt, to offer up the Chriſtian ſacrifice.—Read 1 Pet. iii. 18.—Whatever completes types makes a concluſion; that therefore did Chriſt. —On 1 Pet. i. 20. we obſerve, that as Chriſt was the Lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world, he muſt be the only propitiatory Sacrifice for the ſins of *all mankind*.—According to Heb. x. 2, 3. whatever ſacrifice is *repeated*, cannot take away ſin.—Either Chriſt *ſuffers* in the Sacrifice of the Maſs, or he does not; if he ſuffers, he muſt be ever ſuffering (againſt Phil. ii. 9.—Heb. ix. 26.) if not, it is no real ſacrifice; add Heb. ix. 22[q].—I will not detain you with producing more authorities in ſo plain a caſe. *Private* Maſſes are againſt 1 Cor. x. 17.—xii. 13. &c.

Maſſes may be called *blaſphemous*, as degrading Chriſt, dragging him, as it were, down from Heaven for a few *ſous*:—merely to deſcribe the thing, ſeems a ſort of blaſphemy.—A poor Prieſt *labouring*, with a *wafer*, in the *occupation* and craft of offering up our bleſſed Lord! treating a happy and glorious Being, "crowned with glory and honour," (Heb. ii. 9.) as wretched and deſpicable! nay *numberleſs* Prieſts doing this at the ſame time; and muttering at numberleſs Altars!—Books of Travels,

[p] On this text the Rhemiſts remark, "Perilous reading of Scriptures."

[q] See Biſhop Cleaver, page 18.

Travels, which relate theſe facts, muſt be ſhocking to every ſerious reader.

XI. Maſſes may be called *pernicious*, in regard to the evil conſequences which they tend to produce. They tend to make religion a mere civility; to take Chriſtians off from prayer, and preaching of the word of God; and to give them an eaſy method[r] of evading all their duties, moral and religious. Moreover, by preſenting a *material* object, they hinder men from worſhipping "*in Spirit*[s] and in Truth." They tend to promote *Infidelity* amongſt men of improved underſtandings; and from ſuch, inferior perſons ſoon catch the infection.

XII. And now ſhall I offer any *indirect proof*? the Romaniſts have urged many conſiderations in their own favour, but ſuch as ſeem to be for the moſt part mere *Hypotheſis*, unfounded in Reaſon and Scripture. The doctrine of the Maſs might do in the *dark* ages, but it will not bear the light. The Romaniſts, where they are improved, reſemble a man, who becauſe he has planned ſomething in a fit of melancholy, rage, or intoxication, determines to carry it into execution at all hazards, when he is become perfectly ſober and in his right mind; and to juſtify it the beſt he can. However, if any one chuſes to make a buſineſs of examining the Popiſh pleas in favour of the Maſs, he may conſult the Rhemiſh Teſtament[t]; and if he reads the

[r] At Reims, a reverend German Marquis (an Abbé) told me, one Sunday evening, that he had been *à la Meſſe* at five o'clock in the morning; after which he had gone *à la Chaſſe*; (a rabbet-ſhooting;) and that he was then ready to go *à la Comedie*.—This he ſaid very innocently, as conſcious of no fault. Indeed at the Play he was to make ſome little change in his dreſs, that every one might know he was *incognito*.

[s] John iv. 24.

[t] Particularly on Luke xxii.—1 Cor. x. and xi. and on Heb. ix. and x.

the anſwers of Dr. Fulke, I think he will be pleaſed; making an abatement for controverſial language, which is ſeldom pleaſing.

XIII. I fear it would not be to much purpoſe to detain you long on an *Application:* a form of aſſent does not ſeem wanting, and any plan for mutual conceſſions, is deſperate[u].—To the *intereſted* we can only offer 2 Cor. iv. 4. and obſerve, that it is as applicable to thoſe who call themſelves Chriſtians, as to "them which believe not." "The God of this world may blind[x] the minds of either." But to thoſe who are not affected by the immenſe ſums which have been laviſhed away on the ſaying of Maſſes, we may recommend the intereſts of rational piety: let not any of them be afraid[y] to embrace it, though it may ſubvert, for a time, the whole ſyſtem of their national religion: neither let them be afraid that the common people, deprived of their preſent principles, may become wholly unprincipled: the common people amongſt the Proteſtants, have, many of them, much ſolid piety; of a better ſort than the lower people in Popiſh countries: and as to men of letters and ſcience, while the Romaniſts are chiefly Infidels, the Proteſtants can reckon amongſt true believers, thoſe for whoſe underſtandings they have the higheſt eſteem on other accounts; an Addiſon, a Locke, and even a *Newton.* Theſe have all laboured in the cauſe of revealed religion.

If the Romaniſts will not liſten to our brotherly exhortations, let them hear our threats: the rage of paying for Maſſes will not laſt for ever; as men improve,

[u] Halliſax on Prophecy, page 361.

[x] See Comber's Advice, page 39.

[y] P. S. What we find in the ſecond Appendix to Moſheim, ſuits this advice;—I had not read it. Octavo, Vol. 5. page 110. Fenelon's notion.

improve, it will continually grow weaker, and weaker: As Philoſophy riſes, Maſſes will ſink in price; and at length, ſuperſtition will pine away, becauſe no one will be intereſted to maintain and ſupport it. Even Inſtitutions formed by *Legacies*, will have their revenues transferred to other uſes.— But *then*, the minds of all ranks of men will be in a far worſe ſtate than if they had loſt their ſuperſtition in any other manner: inſtead of having a Religion which their reaſon makes them eſteem, at the ſame time that it warms their hearts with devout affection and Chriſtian benevolence, they will have acquired an habit of deſpiſing all religion; and of thinking thoſe moſt degraded, who ſhew the moſt attention to religious[z] truth.

[z] This Lecture was given Feb. 27, 1792; with the accidental omiſſion of Sect. XI. and the laſt paragraph of Sect. X.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXXII.

OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

BISHOPS, Prieſts, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the eſtate of ſingle life, or to abſtain from marriage: therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Chriſtian men, to marry at their own diſcretion, as they ſhall judge the ſame to ſerve better to godlineſs.

---

1. If one could give the *natural principles* of any ſubject, they would connect all facts, and make the beſt *Key* to the *Hiſtory* of men's practice. For all practice is only the operation of natural principles in different circumſtances.—With a view to illuſtrating facts after this manner, I have ſometimes prefixed to my hiſtorical obſervations, ſome attempt at a deſcription of Nature; and the plan ſeems to ſuit our preſent ſubject.

In the Appendix to the Firſt Book, I have ſpoken ſomething of monaſtic Life; have endeavoured to deſcribe it, and account for it; I now only obſerve, that the contemplative abſtemious Monk differs from the Man of the World, very materially; he differs, as to the refinement of his paſſions, and particularly as to the more warm, rapturous, affectionate kind of Piety. At the ſame time, he has his peculiar faults.—With regard to *Marriage*, which on this Article is our chief con-

cern, he is farther removed from it, than one who maintains a conſtant intercourſe with mixed companies.

But amongſt men of the *world*, there may be a great difference in reſpect of marriage, and of motives for engaging in it. One man may be ſo ſituated, that it would be a deſireable thing for him to marry merely on prudential[a] motives; an alliance would enable him to accompliſh the ends which he has chiefly in view. Another is much attracted to marriage; he eſteems it a great good; but he is afraid of loſing what he eſteems a ſtill greater good; he is afraid of loſing a good *ſervice*, a good Fellowſhip, &c. beſides (for that muſt always be ſuppoſed, in order to make ſingle life rightly choſen) that he ſhall be able to reſiſt all *temptations* peculiar to celibacy.

Now ſuppoſe theſe men all to fix their views ſolely on the *good* of promoting *religion*, at the time they have marriage in view: the *Monk* would engage in ſingle life with readineſs, in order to promote it; would probably condemn marriage, or at leaſt highly applaud continence; and would feel himſelf elated and purified. The man of the *world*, in the firſt ſituation, would perceive, that, in his own way, he could beſt promote religion by aſſociating with himſelf a certain female partner, and following a certain plan. The other, would tend forcibly towards a married ſtate, but he would ſee, that, in his caſe, connexions and incumbrances would impede him ſo much, that he could not freely exert himſelf; could not, on the whole,

[a] It is reckoned prudent for a Man-midwife to be a married man; and a candidate for a Chaplaincy of a Society of Females: as Magdalens, Aſylum, &c.—Or prudence may be pleaded *againſt* marrying: Le Mariage eſt une choſe très ſerieuſe; on ne peut pas trop y penſer: Heureux celui qui y penſe toute ſa vie.

whole, do that good, in promoting religion, which he particularly meditated. We need proceed no farther in order to ſee, how men might be ſituated, in reſpect of marriage, upon the firſt propagation of the Chriſtian Religion.

It has been before obſerved, that men could ſcarcely, at firſt, enter into Chriſtianity, without being agitated: they muſt be under continual alarms; their views muſt be fixed on heavenly objects; their affections ſet on things above: where their treaſure was, there would their *heart* be alſo. This is a diſpoſition very unfavourable to marriage; or to allowing it its due ſhare of praiſe; and the prevalence of the oriental Philoſophy would make it more unfavourable[b]. Such a temper would regard the marriage of *Prieſts*, as a want of ſelf-government, as a degradation of the ſacred character. Now if we conceive this temper working forcibly through a number of ages, and always combated by the natural propenſity to marriage, and by the more ordinary feelings of common ſenſe and active life, we ſhall have a general ſketch of the Hiſtory before us.

11. Though the ſacred writers themſelves ſeem to me perfectly free from every thing flighty, yet in the *Apoſtolic Age* Chriſtians began to find, or fancy, that attentions to their Wives, prevented their being ſuch good Chriſtians as they might be. And, in ſome caſes, both partners were of the ſame mind: they ſeparated, at bed, though not at board; ſo that the wife became a ſort of *Siſter*. —*Hermas*, at the beginning of his firſt *Viſion*, ſpeaks of a woman, whom he had begun to love *as a Siſter*,

[b] Moſheim ſays, that *malignant Spirits* were thought to have moſt influence over married people, quarto, Vol. 1. page 137.

Siſter, and he is afterwards[c] told that his *Wife* muſt be his *Siſter*.

Baſilides is placed by Cave in the year 112; many ſtrange things have been ſaid of him; but in Lardner's Book of Hereſies they are compared, and a ſober judgment formed out of them. That judgment is[d], that Baſilides valued continence, not on monaſtic principles, abſolutely, in itſelf, but only with regard to the good effects it would produce in any particular juncture; on the ground of its utility in any particular circumſtances:—if it produced the greateſt good, in any caſe, in *that* caſe, it was to be commended and practiſed; otherwiſe it was not neceſſary or required. This fell ſo far ſhort of the high notions of ſome ſects of Chriſtians, that it was accounted *heretical*.

The *Manicheans* only *tolerated* marriage even in what they called their *Auditors*[e], in their *elect*, they did not even tolerate it.—The Manicheans are placed as firſt flouriſhing about the end of the third Century.

It ſeems clear that, however ſome might be *admired* for not marrying, ſome of the Clergy *did* marry, or *were* married men, during the whole[f] of the three firſt centuries. Yet I ſuppoſe that *attempts* were continually on foot to prevent their marrying, or to make them ſeparate themſelves from their wives.

During theſe three firſt Centuries, there aroſe a cuſtom for men to have women conſtantly with them, who were called *ſubintroduced* women; *mulieres*

[c] Second Viſion.—See the Note at the beginning of Hermas's firſt Viſion. Edit. Ruſſell.

[d] Her. Baſilides, Sect. 12.—Lardner's Works, Vol. 9. page 285.

[e] Vol. 1. page 349. or Append. to Book 1. Sect. IV. 7.

[f] See Bingham, 4. 5. 5.

mulieres ſubintroductæ; in the Greek Churches, συνεισακτοι :—their employments and characters are not entirely agreed about: *Lardner*[g] ſays, they "were not wives, nor concubines, but perſons maintained as objects of Charity, or elſe for the ſake of domeſtic affairs." Biſhops, and men of great eminence, entertained theſe women; ſome very innocently, I do not doubt; but it ſeems probable, that the connexion would be a ſnare for others, if any times of peace or quiet came on.—This Mulier ſubintroducta ſeems to have been a ſort of continuation of the *Siſter-wife* of *Hermas*.

111. *At the Council of Nice*, in 325, it was propoſed, that ſuch Miniſters as had wives, ſhould put them away; the conduct of *Paphnutius*[h], an Ægyptian Biſhop of ſome eminence, on the occaſion, was ſpirited and liberal:—though bred up a Monk himſelf, unmarried, and remarkable for his chaſte conduct, he cried out in the Aſſembly, that he would not agree to the putting of ſuch "a yoke[i] upon the neck of the Diſciples;"—that cohabiting with a virtuous wife, was chaſtity itſelf;—and that he could by no means agree to anything more than that the unmarried Clergy ſhould continue

[g] Lardner's Works, Vol. 3. page 82, Note.—The idea of marriage without cohabitation was not very uncommon in the times of which we are ſpeaking. Nor was it wholly unknown to the Heathens. See the Life of *Hypatia* in Suidas; or Lardner's Works, Vol. 9. page 83.—Some Chriſtians have run into the folly of performing what may be called *feats* of chaſtity or continence: that is, have expoſed themſelves voluntarily to very great temptations in order to boaſt of their power of overcoming them. See the accounts of *D'Arbriſſel*, founder of the Abbey of *Fontevraud*, who died in the year 1117. Bayle's Dict. under *Fontevraud*. Gibbon's Hiſt. quarto, Vol. 1. Chap. 15. page 485.

[h] Suidas from Socrates, 1. 11. and Sozom. 1. 23. Bingham, 4. 5. 7. from the ſame.

[i] Acts xv. 10.

tinue ſingle. He had weight to ſtop the impoſition of the reſtraint propoſed.

At this famous Council a *Canon*[k] was made againſt the *ſubintroduced* women, which I will read.

The general *turn* of the Religious, was to celibacy; and fine eulogiums were written upon chaſtity, and other *Aſcetic* perfections, by Tertullian, Ambroſe, and moſt of the Fathers: though Tertullian did write two Books *Ad Uxorem*; to his own wife.

IV. The firſt check which this humour met with, was from *Jovinian*, a Monk of Milan, in the fourth Century; we have mentioned his idea, that Satan has not power to ſeduce a true Chriſtian, under the ſixteenth Article[l]; but he was more famous for holding[m], that wives may be as good Chriſtians as Virgins can be. Lardner conſiders him as having been of the ſame opinion with Baſilides; as already[n] deſcribed.—*Vigilantius*, a Preſbyter of Gaul, in the fifth Century, is ſpoken of with Jovinian; they both oppoſed ſeveral growing cuſtoms of Chriſtians, which had ariſen from a too great luxuriance of Piety.—*Jerom* is very indignant againſt Vigilantius, whom he deſcribes as ſaying, that no Clergyman ought to remain unmarried. This notion he amplifies and exaggerates thus; et niſi (Epiſcopi) prægnantes uxores viderint Clericorum, infanteſque de ulnis matrum vagientes, Chriſti Sacramenta non tribuunt[o]:—(will not *ordain* them).

The

[k] Councils, by Labbé, or others. In Engliſh, Lardner's Works, Vol. 3. page 82. Note.

[l] Art. XVI. Sect. IX.

[m] Bower's Life of Siricius.

[n] The opinion is Beauſobre's, but adopted by Lardner; Works, Vol. 9. page 285.

[o] Jerom adv. Vigilant. C. 1. laſt Vol. but one, page 281, 2d Tome.

The Pope, by whom Jovinian and his followers were condemned, was *Siricius*, who died in the year 398: he is uſually ſaid to be the firſt who *forbade* the marriage of his Clergy; but I ſuppoſe many of them were married after his time.

The *ſtruggle* between lofty notions of religious purity, and ordinary ones of natural propenſities, ſeems never[p] to have intermitted; but we muſt not attempt more than to mark its principal appearances.

v. *Gregory* VII. called *Hildebrand*, who died in 1085, is ſpoken of as having the moſt completely and univerſally effected the celibacy[q] of the Clergy. —Thoſe before him are thought to have been *ſuperſtitious* in diſcouraging marriage; he to have done it from motives of *policy*.—Yet it is owned, I ſuppoſe, that he was a man of ſtrict purity in private life, and ſincerely zealous for the Reformation of manners[r].

VI. In *England*, according to Fox, Marriage of Prieſts was firſt forbidden by *Anſelm*, Archbiſhop of Canterbury, in a Council at London.—In another Council, held in the year 1104, five years[s] before his death, at Wincheſter, there is a reference

[p] *Intermediate* deciſions were made in the ſixth general Council, held at Conſtantinople 580, called Quiniſextum, or in Trullo, (or Trulla): Cave, Vol. 1. page 605.—Dupin's Compendium, Vol. 2. page 295.

[q] Burnet on the Article.—Biſhop Hallifax on Prophecy, page 352—355.—Comber's Advice, page 15. 43.—Fox's Martyrol. Vol. 2. page 463.

[r] The particular year when Prieſts firſt gave a promiſe of celibacy, and Biſhops took an oath to ordain no married man, is ſaid by Fox to have been 1067; but Comber mentions 1074: both ſpeak from ancient hiſtorians.

[s] Fox, Vol. 2. page 463. 483. the *date* of the former Council I do not find in Fox:—Of which Henry Huntington ſays, "In quo *prohibuit* Sacerdotibus Anglorum uxores antea non prohibitas." Prohibiting is not preventing. But *Cave* does not

reference to a former one held at London; but Henry I[t]. connived at the Prieſts' marrying; and there has been much *connivance* at this offence, at different times.

VII. St. *Bernard*, called the laſt of the Fathers, died 1153; I was ſurprized to ſee how ſtrongly he inveighs againſt depriving the Prieſts of the liberty of marrying[u]. He was perfectly *orthodox*, Head of one great Monaſtery (Clairvaux) and founder of 160 others.

VIII. The Marriage of Prieſts was, about the time we are ſpeaking of, very unpopular in England; it occaſioned *riots*, in which the ſacred elements, conſecrated by married Prieſts, were thrown into the dirt, and trodden under foot.—The Prieſts who had wives, were called by the opprobrious name of *Nicolaïtans*[x].

IX. Pope Pius II. called Æneas Sylvius before he came to the Popedom, died in 1464; he is famous[y] for having ſaid, "Marriage was for great reaſons forbidden Prieſts, and for greater[z] is to be reſtored to them."—By *greater*, intimating the danger not only of ſuch incontinence as he himſelf had been guilty of, but alſo of unnatural vices.

X. In

not clear up theſe matters, ſo I leave them: He has no Council at Wincheſter in 1134.—And it appears that *Lancfranc* held a council againſt the Marriage of Prieſts in 1076.

Cave ſays, that in 1102 Anſelm held a Council at London, but he does not mention marriage of Prieſts, in his account of it. There ſeems to have been a great deal of buſineſs undertaken at this Council.

[t] See an original record to this purpoſe in John Fox, Vol. 1. page 253.—A proclamation of Anſelm's.

[u] See Fox, Vol. 2. page 483.—Comber's Advice, page 43.

[x] Fox, Vol. 2. page 465. 479.—Rev. ii. 6. 15.

[y] Burnet on the Article.—Comber, page 42.—Baxter on Councils, page 448.—Fox, Vol. 2. page 466.—Bower's Lives of the Popes.

[z] Baxter on Councils, page 448.

X. In the *Greek* Church we are informed, by *Brerewood*, in one part of his book, that no marriage[a] is allowed *after* Ordination; and in another[b] paſſage, that the *Ruſſians*, in particular, ordain only thoſe who *are* married.—Neither of theſe rules allows a Clergyman to marry a *ſecond* time. Indeed *ſecond marriages* have been declared againſt by many ſets of Chriſtians[c]; probably with a view to 1 Tim. iii. 2. "The huſband of *one wife*."

XI. In the twenty-fourth Seſſion of the Council of Trent, the Marriage of Prieſts was diſcuſſed, but there is only one Canon againſt it (the ninth), which contains nothing remarkable. The next Canon anathematizes all thoſe, who do not hold, that ſingle life is better and more happy (or more bleſſed, melius et beatius), than married life.—In the Trent Catechiſm I ſee nothing on the ſubject; perhaps becauſe the Catechiſm was only for the people; which reaſon will extend to the Neceſſary Doctrine.

XII. At the time of the *Reformation*, men ſtood diſpoſed as is deſcribed by Biſhop *Burnet* at the beginning of his Expoſition of this Article; they were remarkably attentive to the miſchiefs which might ariſe, either from a continuance of the Clergy in that ſingle ſtate, to which many ſcandalous irregularities ſeemed to be owing; or from reducing perſons of ſacred characters to the level of ordinary men, and ſetting them in the light of ſlaves

[a] Brerewood on Languages, page 127.

[b] Page 137.

[c] See Dr. Redman's opinion in Strype's Cranmer, page 157.—John Fox, Vol. 1. page 36.—Dr. Thomas, Biſhop of Lincoln in 1757, was ſaid to be married to his fourth wife, and to have, as a motto of a ring, "*If I ſurvive, I'll make it five.*"—The ſame ſtory has been told of others; it is only mentioned here as proving, that a ſucceſſion of marriages were not diſreputable even to a Prelate.

ſlaves to ſenſual appetites. It will appear probable, from what has been ſaid, that men *ſhould* ſtand ſo affected, in ſuch a conjuncture.

Amongſt the propoſitions of *Wickliffe* and *Huſs* condemned at the Council of Conſtance[d], I do not ſee any relating to the Marriage of Prieſts.

The *Reformed Churches* declare[e] againſt forbidding Prieſts to marry. Some mix the marriage of Prieſts with that of Laymen; but the Confeſſion of *Augſburg* has a ſeparate chapter for the marriage of Prieſts: amongſt other evils of the prohibition, it mentions, that ſome good men, by their conflicts with the weakneſs of their nature, have been reduced to a ſtate of *deſperation*. That writing of Biſhop *Jewel's*, which is called part of the *Engliſh* Confeſſion, I will read; as it contains much good matter in[f] a ſmall compaſs.—The firſt page of that of Augſburg (on this ſubject) is worth reading.—The *Helvetic* in one place, ſays, that ſingle men, ſuppoſing them virtuous and eaſy, are *more fit* for taking care of ſacred things, than thoſe who are diſtracted by the cares of a[g] Family:—and, a little after, condemns thoſe who condemn ſecond marriages.

One of the *Six Articles* is, "Prieſts may not marry by the Law of God."—*John Fox* in his Martyrology, (or Acts and Monuments[h], &c.) has given a particular Hiſtory, and a great deal of argument,

[d] Art. XXI. Sect. 11.

[e] In caſting my eye over the Confeſſions in the Syntagma, I did not ſee the ſubject in the French, Dutch, or Scotch; nor in the Poliſh; but it may poſſibly be in any of them, though I believe it is not.

[f] Syntagma, page 117.

[g] Synt. page 84.—*Aptiores* autem hi ſunt curandis rebus divinis, quàm qui privatis familiæ negotiis diſtrahuntur.—This muſt depend upon *circumſtances*.

[h] Vol. 2.

argument, on this and every other of theſe ſix Articles of Henry VIII.

King Edward VI. in 1552, *ratified* the marriages of the Clergy, and made, by Act of Parliament, their children legal *inheritors*.—And in the *Reformatio Legum* there is a chapter in favour of Matrimony, which is warm in defence of the marriage of the Clergy. Archbiſhop *Cranmer* was married; and in his Life by Strype we find ſome good things on our preſent ſubject[i].

In the reign of Queen *Mary* Popery was reſtored, and the Queen gave injunctions to the Biſhops, amongſt other things, "to remove all married clergymen from their[k] wives."—And, in conſequence, "all the married Clergy throughout the kingdom were deprived."

Queen *Elizabeth* did reſtore the Proteſtant Religion, but, in ſome things, ſhe was not ſo forward about it as ſome of her ſubjects. It ſeemed a thing of courſe that the Clergy ſhould again be allowed to marry; but Elizabeth refuſed to authorize their marriage, openly, by *Law*; ſhe was indeed willing to *connive* at it, but that would not ſecure *legitimacy* of children[l]. Her backwardneſs cauſed the trouble of particular acts, as I underſtand, of *legitimation*. How deſirous ſhe was to clog and impede all clerical marriages, appears from her Injunctions in 1559[m]; in which ſhe orders, that no Prieſt ſhall marry any woman except he have the conſent of his *Biſhop*, two neighbouring *Juſtices*, and the woman's *Parents*.—

If

[i] Strype's Life of Cranmer.—See Dr. Redman's opinion, page 157.—Cranmer's, page 161.

[k] Neal, Vol. 1. page 60.—John Fox, Vol. 1. page 36.

[l] Strype's Annals, Vol. 1. page 80.—I think Archbiſhop Parker had a Son legitimated, by Act of Parliament.—Neal, Vol. 1. page 117.

[m] Sparrow's Collection, page 76. Cap. 29.

If no Parents, the conſent of Relations; if no Relations, of Maſter or Miſtreſs: beſides Banns, &c.—Theſe impediments argue either a ſtrong prejudice in the Queen, or an opinion, that the marriage of the Clergy was ſtill *unpopular*.

XIII. *Dupin*[n] is very tolerant about the marriage of Prieſts: he allows "that Prieſts may marry, where the Laws of the Church do not prohibit it."

Here ends our *Hiſtory*.

XIV. The *Explanation* will be much ſhorter.

In the *Title*, the word "*Prieſts*," I conſider as a *generic* term, including all orders of eccleſiaſtical Miniſters. In the Article, all thoſe orders are ſpecified, which ſubſiſt in our Church.

"Not *commanded:*" to ſee the force of this, we ſhould examine with what it is *conſiſtent*; ſuppoſe any one ſhould be of opinion that ſingle life is *better* for Prieſts than married life; (melius et beatius) that it is *recommended* in Scripture, that it will be *rewarded*, &c. &c. ſtill he might agree, that it is not "*commanded.*"

"*By God's Law*,"—this is the expreſſion of one of the *ſix Articles* of Henry VIII. and may allude to them: ſuppoſe any one thought celibacy of Prieſts was commanded by the *Canon* Law, the Law of the Church, or the Law of *England*, or even the Law of *Nature*, ſtill he might aſſent to this *Article*, except he thought it was commanded by *Scripture*. Only it ſhould be underſtood, that if Scripture was found to refer to any other Law, or ratify it, then its being commanded by that Law, would be the ſame as its being commanded by Scripture. Indeed the Law of Nature is God's Law; but the ſcripture ſeems here to be meant.

"Either

[n] Third Append. to Moſheim.

"Either to *vow* the eſtate of ſingle life, or to *abſtain* from marriage;"—that is, either to abſtain in conſequence of a vow, or without vowing. I ſuppoſe, that the Romiſh Clergy *do* take a vow of celibacy upon Ordination; as our Clergy uſed to do in the time of *Anſelm*[o], and ever ſince, probably, till the Reformation.

"As for all *other* Chriſtian men,"—does this make it neceſſary for us to *prove*, that it is lawful for Chriſtians *in general* to marry?—the Title is only of *Prieſts*; but if Prieſts may marry, Laymen may, *à fortiori*. And the ſcriptural expreſſions are common to all ſorts and conditions of men. This clauſe beginning "therefore," was *added* in 1562, ſo means ſomething againſt monaſtic Life in general.

"As they ſhall *judge*," &c. this does not ſeem properly a part of our Article: however, it is a good moral direction, and tends to ſhew the reaſonableneſs of the liberty allowed; and that it is of an honourable, worthy ſort:—and does it not imply, that our Church *prefers neither* ſingle nor married life abſolutely? but either, which, in any particular caſe, is beſt for a man's *morals?* in which he will be the *beſt Man?*

XV. Next comes the *Proof*.—I ſee but *one propoſition*.

'Prieſts are allowed, by Scripture, to marry.'

Matt. viii. 14. Shews that St. Peter was married.

Acts xxi. 9. implies that St. Philip was alſo married.

Acts xviii. 2. ſhews the ſame of *Aquila*[p]. Alſo 1 Cor. xvi. 19.

I venture

[o] John Fox, Vol. 2. page 483.

[p] Aquila ſeems to have been accompanied by his wife Priſcilla while employed in teaching Chriſtianity. He alſo ſeems, from Acts xviii. 26. to have been more than an ordinary teacher;

I venture to add, for the preſent,

1 Cor. ix. 5. It does not ſhew that Paul was married; but, according to our verſion, that he claimed a right to marry; and that thoſe who were called our Lord's Brothers, were married; that is, James[q], Simon, &c.—So much for Precedents.

Matt. xix. 12. at the end, implies, that ſome are, in ſome ſenſe, *unable* to live ſingle: therefore there can be no *command* to do ſo.—Prieſts are not excepted.

1 Cor. vii. 2. 9. implies, that to marry may *ſometimes* be a *duty:* and no exception is made.

Eph. v. 32. and preceding, might be conſidered; I would ſubmit, whether St. Paul would have uſed his *Allegory* about Chriſt and the Church, his *Spouſe*, if it was unlawful for St. Paul, or any other miniſter of the Church, to marry.

In 1 Tim. iii. 2. 4. and Titus i. 6. it is plainly implied, that Miniſters may be married.—And from 1 Tim. iv. 3. it appears, that "*forbidding to marry*," was one of the marks of *evil times*.

Heb. xiii. 4. ſhews, that "marriage is honourable in *all:*" who ſhall preſume to make an exception? compare 1 Cor. vii. 2. Shall not a miniſter connect himſelf as thoſe were connected, who were fixed upon for Miniſters?

The *Jewiſh* Prieſts did marry undoubtedly.

If

teacher; eſpecially conſidering that *Apollos*, to whom he expounded the way of God more perfectly, was himſelf a teacher.

[q] See Art. VI. Sect. XXV.

If it ſhould appear, from any part of Scripture, that we are made *judges* of the evils of continuing ſingle, it then becomes *ſcriptural* to apply every thing which Hiſtory and experience have taught us.

XVI. This may ſuffice for direct proof; on this Article we muſt have ſome indirect. Not but ſome of the arguments of our adverſaries are again *frivolous*; I ſhall content myſelf without proving, that St. *Peter* did cohabit with his[r] wife; or that there was ſuch a thing in the Latin Church as a man's retaining a wife after his appointment to the Miniſtry:—Yet there are *ſome* difficulties which are worthy of a ſolution, if we can ſuggeſt one.

XVII. It is urged that αδελφην γυναικα, in 1 Cor. ix. 5. is not rightly tranſlated, *a Siſter, a Wife*; it ſhould be a *Chriſtian woman*:—and ſo indeed Mr. *Locke* underſtands it; one to *wait* upon an Apoſtle, and provide thoſe things for him, which in modern times are provided at Inns.—The *context* is not about a right to marry, but about a right to have *accommodations* provided.—Our marginal tranſlation of γυναικα, is, *woman*.—I feel diffident about two ſubſtantives put together; they ſeem to make an uncommon, or ſingular, expreſſion; yet αδελφην γυναικα ſhould mean ſomething more than αδελφην ſingly; why is γυναικα added? if the expreſſion had been uſed by St. *Peter*, inſtead of St. Paul, I ſhould have underſtood it of his *wife*; and I ſhould have taken the meaning of αδελφην from what we ſaid about *Hermas's*[s] *Siſter-wife*.

Peter

[r] Rhem. Teſt. on Matt. viii. 14. and on 1 Tim. iii. 2.

[s] Sect. 11.—Perhaps one ſhould not omit obſerving, that *Homines* Chriſtiani, means the ſame as Chriſtiani without homines; let the obſervation *apply* as it may.—But Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. 1 Cor. ix. 5. makes a difference between γυναικα αδελφην and αδελφην γυναικα. And ſo, between *mulierem ſororem*, which is the expreſſion of the vulgate, and *ſororem uxorem*, which he thinks right.

Peter is ſaid to have *done* that which Paul *claimed* a right to do: whom could Peter lead about but his wife? Paul was ſingle[t], and did not do the thing which he claimed a right to do; certainly he might have led about a Chriſtian *Woman*.—Is the meaning this? 'might I not, if I pleaſed, put the Converts to the *expence* of maintaining not only me, but a female companion? For if I had a *Wife*, as Peter has, I might take her with me, as he does; not for the ſake of conjugal endearment, that would impede my proper buſineſs, but as a ſort of *Siſter*.' —If it were quite ſure that all the perſons of whom Paul ſpeaks in this paſſage, were married[u], I ſhould be apt to conclude, that he meant by γυναικα, a *Wife*.

However, if 1 Cor. ix. 5. ſhould not make *for* the marriage of Prieſts, it can make nothing *againſt* it.

XVIII. But it may be urged, that Matt. xix. 11, 12. and 1 Cor. vii. ſeem to recommend celibacy as ſomething *ſuperior* to married life; as more pure and perfect. I anſwer, this has been[x] thought, yet without reaſon, as far as I can judge. But, though that were the meaning of theſe ſcriptures, yet

[t] 1 Cor. vii. 7.

[u] Some have ſaid that *all* the Apoſtles were married, except Paul; but I fancy they uſe this verſe as proof: taking for granted that γυνη here means *wife*.—Clemens Alexandrinus ſays, that the Apoſtles who led about with them a Siſter, a Wife, might make them uſeful in *teaching* women religion in private. And ſo, "the doctrine of the Lord might enter into the cloſet of women," "without any reprehenſion or evil ſuſpicion." Fulke on Rhem. Teſt. 1 Cor. ix. 5. from Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 3.

P. S. The notion of Clemens Alex. ſeems like my own; that the Apoſtles led about wives, not "*as Wives*, but *as Siſters*;" as aſſiſtants. Might not an Apoſtle take with him ſometimes a *real Siſter?* if particularly well qualified for inſtructing females?

[x] See John Fox, Vol. 1. page 3.

yet the paſſages cannot be thought, by recommending, to *command* men to live ſingle;—rather the contrary; a meaſure is recommended becauſe it cannot be commanded; they make no difference between Clergy and Laity, and it is abſurd to think, that it is ſo much as recommended to all men to live ſingle.—But let us conſider the ſenſe of the two paſſages.

Matt. xix. 11, 12. and 1 Cor. vii. may be taken together.—Difficulties and obſtacles lie in the way to marriage; a man is alarmed with not being able to get a *Divorce* (Matt. xix. 9, 10.)—or he is afraid, that if he marries, he ſhall not be able (1 Cor. vii.) to execute the truſt committed to him, of promoting a new Religion of divine original. Or if he really, at bottom, wiſhes to marry, he propoſes his difficulties as if he was led by them to *deſire* a ſingle life: perhaps under ſome degree of ſelf-deceit. He aſks[y] *advice*. His adviſer replies, as ſuppoſing him ſincere, Marriage is an affair about which I can give you no advice *upon the whole*; at leaſt upon the whole I dare not adviſe you *againſt* it: you muſt *judge for yourſelf*; the deciſion depends in a great meaſure upon your own *feelings*; and thoſe it is impoſſible for me to enter into with ſuch exactneſs as to direct you properly: all that the beſt adviſer can do, is only to ſuggeſt *particular conſiderations*; you muſt afterwards complete the deliberation.—So far I can ſuggeſt; that you need not make yourſelf *uneaſy* as if it were an *indiſpenſible* duty to marry; experience ſhews that it is not; for it ſhews, that Nature has[z] diſqualified ſome perſons, in body, or in mind; and others, men of the beſt characters, have

[y] Matt. xix. 10.—1 Cor. vii. 1.

[z] Lardner's Works, Vol. 9. page 284. from Beauſobre's opinion of Baſilides.

have found it the greateſt good to give themſelves up to promote the intereſts of Religion: theſe, by ſetting their affections on things above, may be ſaid to have diſqualified themſelves: you may therefore be perfectly eaſy on that head; it is no more expected that all *men* ſhould propagate their ſpecies, than that all *plants* or animals ſhould.—But perhaps you may *wiſh* to marry, and may really be afraid leſt, by marrying, you ſhould involve yourſelf in difficulties inextricable[a]; or leſt you ſhould encumber yourſelf, and divert your affections, ſo that you cannot exert yourſelf freely, in performing the works of virtue or *piety*[b], which you meditate. I repeat, I cannot, I dare not adviſe you not to marry, on the whole; but I will mention anything that occurs to me: were you to marry, you might fall into ſome "*preſent*[c] *diſtreſs*;" I can ſee that things are ſo ſituated, that you might "have trouble in[d] the *fleſh*," if you had a family to conduct; I can alſo inform you, that I feel no diſſatisfaction with my *own*[e] ſituation as a ſingle man; and as to the things of religion, certainly the fewer worldly and domeſtic[f] cares you have, the leſs diſtracted will be your attention; and ſo I could go on ſuggeſting particular motives; but after all, you muſt *determine:* if you aſk, *why*, I anſwer, becauſe you only can judge whether it is *ſafe* for your *morals*[g] to live a ſingle life: that is the principal thing to be conſidered, and you can only judge of your ſecurity by your *habits* and your feelings: every motive muſt be ſubſervient to motives of *duty:* were I to preſs you to live a ſingle life, and you fell into *ſin*, I ſhould never be able

[a] Matt. xix. 9. [b] 1 Cor. vii. 32. 34, 35.
[c] Verſe 26. [d] Verſe 28. [e] Verſe 7, 8.
[f] Verſe 33. 35. [g] Verſe 2.

able to conſole myſelf for having "caſt a *ſnare*[h] upon you;"—for having given you advice when you was not "*able to receive*[i] *it*:"—*able*, I mean, as every one muſt conceive me to mean, without its ruining your *principles*.—No; whatever good there may be in avoiding marriage, in any circumſtances, whatever evils marriage might occaſion, they are not to be compared to evils of being perpetually tormented by *ſinful paſſions*; it muſt always be "better to marry than to burn[k]."—If you feel yourſelf weak, do not attempt arduous taſks: "marriage[l] is honourable in all," and yet men may in ſome ſituations rightly prefer a ſingle ſtate; and whatever virtue any man practices, in any ſtate, he ſhould conſider it as the *gift*[m] *of God*; (Matt. xix. 11.—1 Cor. vii. 7.) But God forbid that any principle of *ambition*, though of the moſt laudable ſort, ſhould ever induce you to avoid marriage, if you cannot conduct yourſelf rightly in a ſingle condition; if you cannot fully reſolve to do the duties

[h] Verſe 35.
[i] Matt. xix. 12.
[k] 1 Cor. vii. 9.
[l] Heb. xiii. 4.

[m] Why is virtue in ſingle life here ſaid to be the *Gift of God*, and not virtue in married life? becauſe that would not have been to the preſent *purpoſe*. The queſtion probably is, may I live *ſingle*, notwithſtanding ſome dangers of ſingle life? the anſwer is, yes, if you think you ſhall have the *virtues* of ſingle life; but every man has not theſe particular virtues; which, when referred to God, is, it is not *given* to every man to live in ſingle life.—Suppoſe the queſtion had been, may I *marry*, notwithſtanding ſome dangers of a married life? (thoſe of immoderate anxiety, worldly-mindedneſs, &c.) the anſwer would be juſt the ſame; yes, if you think you ſhall have the *virtues* of a married life; but every man has not thoſe particular virtues; or, it is not *given* to every man to live well in a married life.—St. Paul ſeems to conceive, that one man may (from his temper, habits, &c.) be moſt virtuous in a ſingle ſtate, another in a married ſtate. "Every man hath his proper (peculiar) gift of God; one after this manner, and another after that." (ver. 7.)

duties of it, and keep yourſelf unſpotted from its corruptions.

Such is the meaning which the two paſſages objected (Matt. xix. 11, 12. and 1 Cor. vii.) convey to my mind. They do not ſeem to give any abſolute preference, or aſcribe any general perfection to a ſingle ſtate; but only to direct men how to *conduct* themſelves *in caſe* they are thrown into any ſituations which ſeem to them to be favourable to celibacy:—that abſtinence from marriage is deſireable in ſuch particular ſituations, on ſome particular *accounts*, is a thing taken for granted, or *ſuppoſed*.

If any one examines 1 Cor. vii. on the ground here deſcribed, let him take notice when St. Paul ſpeaks from authority, and when ſpeaks *of himſelf*. He ſpeaks his private judgment in verſes 6. 10. 25. 40.—And it might be well to compare Col. ii. 20–23. according to the explanation of it before[n] given.—And to conſider, that when St. Paul ſays, (ver. 1.) "It is good for a man not to touch a woman;" he muſt ſay it with a view to ſome particular ſituations; ſaid *univerſally*, it could not be true; nor can it more be called univerſal than, "let *every* man have his own wife," ver. 2.—We may add, that recommending occaſional abſtinence *after* marriage[o], preſuppoſes marriage, and is no diſcouragement to marry; rather an encouragement to very pious people; as it ſhews them, that conjugal duty and piety are not incompatible.

If my idea of Matt. xix. 11, 12[p]. and of 1 Cor. vii. be juſt, deliberations on marriage, as right or wrong,

[n] Art. XIV. Sect. III. [o] 1 Cor. vii. 5.

[p] I might have made *two* caſes of theſe, but the ſame reaſons applying to both, there muſt have been ſome tautology. In both I can fancy ſome *ſelf-deceit*, though anſwers are given on the ſame footing as if the propoſals to live ſingle had been quite ſincere:

wrong, ought to turn upon principles of moral *utility*, in each perſon's particular *circumſtances*.—We may therefore obſerve, that it may be much eaſier to "attend upon the Lord without diſtraction[q]," in married Life, *now*, than during the firſt propagation of the Goſpel.—That times of *danger* differ greatly from times of *ſecurity*: that the former call generally for *ſingle* Miniſters, the latter for *married*; as danger leſſens the ſtrength of the paſſions now under conſideration, and ſecurity increaſes it. And that it may often happen, that a *ſingle* ſtate may be beſt adapted to the duties of *ſtudy* and contemplation, and a married ſtate to the ordinary *paſtoral* duties; in which a *wife* or a daughter may perform ſome of Offices of an ancient *Deaconeſs*: Such obſervations as theſe may be made, and may be of ſome uſe; yet they ſhould always be underſtood as capable of variation and modification

ſincere: unleſs any one ſhould allow ſomething of a refined *raillery* in the anſwer given by Chriſt himſelf.

In the firſt caſe, I can fancy a *peeviſh Jew*, (Art. VII. Sect. XIV. or Vol. 3. page 78.) vexed that he cannot follow his caprice in *divorcing*; and urging, with ſome petulance; one had better not marry at *all* than be fettered in this way! thinking this a ſufficient objection to our Saviour's ſtrictneſs;—yet *ſpeaking*, as a *diſciple* (Matt. xix. 10.), who would be *reckoned* to give up all for Chriſt, and perſuading himſelf that he really would. His Lord anſwers, do not be uneaſy; you are not *obliged* to marry, if you do not approve it; and ſo on, as before.

In the ſecond caſe, I can fancy a convert, who would willingly perſuade himſelf that he is very zealous for the cauſe of Chriſtianity, ſtruck with the interruption which it would give to his *domeſtic* enjoyments if he devoted himſelf wholly to promoting it. He hopes, (though he is ſcarce conſcious of ſuch an hope) that St. Paul will tell him to marry at all events; but he *expreſſes* his difficulty by propoſing to live *ſingle*: St. Paul treats his propoſal candidly, but ſeriouſly: and takes the occaſion of giving good advice, generally uſeful; but does not (as perhaps had been expected) wholly reject the propoſal.

[q] Verſe 35.

modification from the circumſtances and diſpoſitions of particular men.

In ſhort, if ſome ſituations are beſt filled by miniſters who are married, and others by the unmarried; and if a ſenſe of *duty* may rightly impel ſome miniſters to marry, and others to remain ſingle; neither a ſtate of celibacy nor of marriage ſhould be *forbidden*. And if anything whatſoever makes *reſtraints* pernicious, that is enough for the purpoſe of our Article.

Let thoſe marry, who judge it beſt to do ſo; as many may ſtill remain ſingle as find, that a ſingle life will, in their peculiar circumſtances, "ſerve better to godlineſs," either in preventing moral evil, or in promoting ſpiritual good.

XIX. Not to conclude without ſome *Application*, I will juſt obſerve, that *Dupin* is, on this Article, ſo tolerant, as to leave no room for diſpute, or for reconciliation.

One might conclude with the end of the Homily[r] againſt Adultery.

[r] Homilies, page 104. octavo.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXXIII.

OF EXCOMMUNICATE PERSONS, HOW THEY ARE TO BE AVOIDED.

THAT perſon, which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be openly reconciled by penance, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto.

---

1. When we were treating of the Romiſh[a] Sacraments, we divided *Penance* into private and public. Public cenſure of a church, eſpecially that ignominious *exciſion*, which ſeemed to degrade a man from the ſociety of Chriſtians, to that of malignant ſpirits, has been always intereſting; from the infinite importance of ſuch a degradation, and its powerful influence on the mind.

This Article may be conceived as including the whole ſubject of *Church-Diſcipline*. As all penalties are ſubmitted to, in a church properly ſo called, independent of all political *ſtates*, through the dread of excommunication. In the twentieth Article we ſpoke of ceremonies, &c. but nothing of Diſcipline.

II. *Imprecations*,

[a] Art. XXV. Sect. IV.

11. *Imprecations*, of a direful nature, were in uſe amongſt[b] the *Heathens*, and *excluſion* from ſacred rites, was alſo practiſed[c].—What *Cæſar* ſays of the religious diſcipline of the ancient *Druids*, bears a ſtrong reſemblance to that in later times[d].

The *Jews* had the puniſhment of *exciſion*, by the Law of *Moſes*:—they were for ſome offences, "cut off from the *Congregation*[e]." And the *Rabbins* have multiplied exciſions greatly[f]. Their method of ſupplying the loſs of their criminal juriſdiction, while they were in captivity at *Babylon*, was curious. They inflicted *imaginary* puniſhments, in the belief, that they would be realized by Jehovah; as, for inſtance, if a man committed an offence which, by the Law was puniſhed by *ſtoning*, they had a confidence, that when he was ſentenced, he would providentially be killed by a ſtone.

Ezra x. 8. and Nehemiah xiii. 28, 29. give ſome notion of penal ſeparation; but the excluſions or ſeparations there ſpoken of ſeem to have been calm and quiet. Some of the ſeparations, or anathemas, denoted by חרם, were attended with *execrations*[g].—*Avoiding* an offender, under ſentence, was uſual.—*Degrees* of excommunication, or exciſion, are differently deſcribed, but there ſeem to have been a *greater* and a *leſs*.—In the time of Chriſt, ſome were caſt out of the Jewiſh[h] *Synagogue*;

[b] Potter's Antiquities, Vol. 1. page 245.

[c] Wilſon's Archæol. Dict. under Excommunication.

[d] Cæſar de Bello Gallico, Lib. 6. Cap. 13. (or page 209. Edit. Variorum 1651, Lugd. Bat.)

[e] Exod. xii. 19. There is a number of texts in the Concordance under *cut-off*.

[f] See Wilſon's Archæol. Dict. under *exciſion*.—Wotton's Miſna, page 155, Vol. 1ſt.—Seder Kodaſhim, Title 7.—Cerethoth.

[g] Forbes, 12. 3. 14.—Limborch, 7. 8. 12.

[h] John ix. 22. 34.—xii. 42.—xvi. 2.—Luke vi. 22.

gogue;—the word εξεβαλον, John ix. 34. is, in the margin, tranſlated, "*excommunicated*." I do not diſtinguiſh between eccleſiaſtical and *civil* expulſion amongſt the Jews, as they were under a *Theocracy*.

111. The firſt Chriſtians carried on the expreſſions to which they had been accuſtomed as Jews; and in ſome degree, followed the Jewiſh practices. We had occaſion to ſay ſomething of this in explaining the word "*accurſed*[i]" in the eighteenth Article.—But what is contained in ſcripture muſt not be enlarged upon here, as it belongs, properly, to our Proof.

The diſcipline of the early churches was mild, without being remiſs, or unequal: free from every idea of partiality, or intereſt. No offender was allowed to offer money, or other preſents. And the dignity of religious ſociety was not let down, when the greateſt perſonages[k] ſtood in need of reproof, or correction.

A learned man[l] ſays, that excommunications *began* with Victor and Zephyrinus Biſhops of Rome: and that private pique occaſioned them. He was no friend to eccleſiaſtical puniſhments.—Tertullian[m], mentions the excluſion of *Valentine* and *Marcion*. Cave places Valentine in 120, Marcion in 130, and Victor in 192.

From the Canons of the Council of Nice, in 325, we ſee, that offenders were excluded, as penitents indeed, for a long term, (that of *ten years* is mentioned once); but that the Biſhops, on perceiving ſtrong marks of genuine remorſe, had ſome diſcretionary

[i] Art. XVIII. Sect. VIII.

[k] An inſtance or two might be read out of Bingham, (Vol 2. page 50. col. 2. being part of 16. 3. 5.):—that of *Valentinian*, and that of *Theodoſius* the Great.

[l] Selden.—See Neal, 2. page 194.

[m] See Bingham, 16. 2. 13.

diſcretionary power of ſhortening[n] the penitence. —One of *our* excommunications is not ſuppoſed to continue ſo long as one of theſe. About this time, the penitents uſed to come to the churches, and within them as far as they were permitted, ſhedding tears, and ſhewing other ſigns of great contrition[o].

The fault mentioned in our Article, of *encouraging* thoſe who are under cenſure, is one which was always noticed. We find in *Cyprian's* time, that the encourager ſhared the ſame fate with the firſt[p] offender.

Auguſtin ſeems to have had an idea, that a Chriſtian who died obſtinate, and refuſed to be reconciled to the Church, was guilty of the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt;—that ſin was ſometimes thought to be final impenitence[q].—Dr. Fulke thinks, that ſuch obſtinate perſon muſt have died an *Heathen*[r]. Yet the ancient Church uſed ſometimes to let offenders die under its diſpleaſure, though it gave them hopes of forgiveneſs from God, and prayed for them.—(Bingham, 16. 2. 16. end.)

The diſtinction between a leſs and a greater excommunication, ſeems to ſuit the difference of offences, and to have prevailed at[s] all times: the *leſs* being excluſion from ſacraments, &c. as a temporary puniſhment, intended to make an offender ſerious,

[n] Firſt Council of Nice, Canon eleventh.

[o] This is mentioned in Dr. Prieſtley's Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2. page 169.

[p] See Forbes, 12. 3. 2.—The ſame thing is ſaid by Thomas a Becket, as decreed by ſome eighth Synod; ſee John Fox, Vol. 1. page 286.

[q] Art. XVI. Sect. IV. Note.

[r] On Rhem. Teſt. Matt. xii. 31.— Wheatly on Common Prayer, page 465.

[s] Forbes, 12. 3. 10.—Bingham, 16. 2. 7. —— , 16. 3. 9. Blackſtone and Burn.

ſerious, humble, penitent, and alarmed about his eternal ſalvation; and at the ſame time to prevent his corrupting the good;—the *greater* being an unlimited excluſion from all *intercourſe* with the regular and pious; the cutting off of one whoſe reformation ſeemed quite *deſperate:* and that *in terrorem*, meant ſometimes, perhaps, as a ſort of foretaſte of future condemnation. So that the leſs excommunication ſeems to have had chiefly in view the good of the offender; the greater, the good of the community.

In order to get an idea of Chriſtian excommunication in the fourth, fifth and ſixth Centuries, it may be ſufficient to keep in mind this diſtinction; and to read the Form by which *Syneſius*[t] paſſes ſentence of the greater excommunication on Andronicus. From which it appears,

1. That when an offender was excommunicated in one church, public notice was given to other churches.

2. That one excommunicated by *one church*, was conſidered as excommunicated by *all*.

3. That if any church *received* the offender, it ſhared in his cenſure, ſo far as to be thought to *deſerve* excommunication, though that puniſhment did not extend to Bodies *Corporate*[u].

4. That the offender was not only excluded from the Sacrament, but from *private*, familiar, convivial intercourſe; from *marriage* and Chriſtian *burial*. Sometimes the pronouncing of ſuch ſentence ſeems to have been attended with *execrations*[x].

Yet this expulſion was not conſidered as annulling *Baptiſm*; ſo that a perſon, if received back into

[t] See Syneſ. Ep. 58. page 199. tranſlated in Bingham, 16. 2. 8.—Cave places him in 410.

[u] Bingham, 16. 3. 7.—Burn's Eccleſ. Law.

[x] Bingham, Vol. 2. page 44. col. 2. part of 16. 2. 17.

into the church, need be *re-baptized*. Nor as taking away *natural* and *civil*[y] rights. The offender was ſometimes *prayed*[z] for.—His *children* were educated as Chriſtians.

As eccleſiaſtical ſociety has no coercive power, no power over perſon or property, when a ſentence was paſt, before any *Nation* was *Chriſtian*, there was a difficulty in getting it *inforced*. Application was made in this caſe, to *Heathen* powers. The Emperor *Aurelian*[a] is mentioned[b] as having lent his civil power to enforce the ſentence of a Chriſtian community.

IV. In the following centuries, as reaſon grew weaker, and ſuperſtition ſtronger, excommunication kept aſſuming a very terrible appearance; and as it was religiouſly *obeyed*, its effects were truly *tremendous*. But if men are too often threatened, though they may ſhrink for a while, they will begin to look about for means of eſcaping the ſtorm;—and thoſe who are to *execute* threats will grow remiſs. When excommunications came to be often repeated, they began to loſe their terrors; and as it is human to run from one extreme to another, they at length came, perhaps, to be *too little* regarded. But this obſervation includes ſome length of *time*.

Excommunication roſe to a great height in the ninth Century[c], but ſtill higher in the eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth.—Then it was reckoned a more terrible puniſhment, than death itſelf. It diſſolved all thoſe *connexions* and mutual obligations, by which the world is generally kept from running into anarchy and diſorder; the connexions of conſanguinity and affinity; the obligations of civil

[y] Bingham, 16. 2. 5.
[z] Forbes, 12. 3. 2.
[a] A. D. 270—275.
[b] Bingham, 16. 2. 3.
[c] Chambers's Dictionary.

civil authority and ſubjection.—The practice of iſſuing national *Interdicts* is ſaid to have begun about the year 1160; but I will *read* to you Fox's account of the excommunication of the Emperor Henry IV. by Hildebrand, (or Gregory VII.) in the year 1076 or 1077, as the firſt inſtance of the kind;—and Hume's account of the Excommunication of King John of England, in the year 1206, as connected with ourſelves[d].

Nor has there been greater extravagance in the effects of excommunication, than in the *manner* in which it has been been conducted. *Ceremonies* have been uſed, more ſuitable to the orgies of the *Furies*, than to ſupporting the kingdom of the Prince of Peace: torches, bells, trampling under[e] foot, execrations compoſed and recited in ſet forms, have ſerved to expreſs the rage of the ſuperſtitious zealots, and to annoy the wretched delinquents.—The *Dead* have not been ſuffered to reſt in quiet: and *Brute* animals, ſuch as rats, flies, caterpillars, have had excommunication denounced againſt them.—As theſe could not be ejected out of any Chriſtian community, I ſhould rather have called it *Imprecation:* However, as a ſentence was to be paſt, it was right to give the *rei* fair play.—It is ſaid, that an *Advocate* was allowed theſe little intruding animals; an inſtance, if true, of wonderful candour and fair dealing!

Indeed,

[d] For the inſtances here mentioned, ſee Bingham, 16. 3. 7. and 16. 2. 5.—Fox's Acts and Monuments, Vol. 1. page 231. 234.—And Hume's Hiſtory of England, A. D. 1206.

[e] Chambers's Dict. from *Fevret*, a Lawyer of Dijon, who died in 1661, and is ſaid to have written a good Treatiſe de *Abuſu*. (Ladvocat). — Of inſult to the dead, the inſtance of Wickliffe has been mentioned, when we ſpoke of the Council of Conſtance, Seſſ. 8. Art. XXI. Sect. 11. —Fox, 1. 515.—— Bingham, 16. 3. 12.—Burnet, page 460. octavo.

Indeed, in more ancient times, when it was the cuſtom to recite aloud the *names* of all thoſe departed Chriſtians who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves, and who had been recorded in the *Diptychs*, or folding books, it was ſometimes found, or thought, neceſſary to *correct the*[f] *Liſts:* ſometimes a name was to be *inſerted*, even though the perſon had been under cenſure, if unjuſtly; and ſo, ſometimes, a name was to be *eraſed*, if any unknown offence appeared: ſuch *eraſing* would be a kind of *anathema*. But if poſthumous praiſe be thought worth giving, it implies that poſthumous blame is to be given alſo, when deſerved.

The meaning of curſing *by Bell, book, and candle*, may be gueſſed at from what has been ſaid, but I will read Dr. Prieſtley's[g] ſhort account of it.

The *Schoolmen* enter into nice queſtions concerning excommunication; and it is a ſubject not barren!—They endeavour to inveſtigate how far God will confirm an erroneous or oppreſſive ſentence;—how a good man is to behave under ſuch a[h] ſentence; what effect any ſentence, juſt or unjuſt, is to have upon a man's friends or relations; with what limitations and reſtrictions he is to be *avoided*, &c. &c.

We are told by *Burn*, that the Synod held at London in 1126, agreed to receive no unknown communicants at any church, for fear of receiving ſuch as had been excommunicated.

v. I imagine we may conceive Excommunication as in conſiderable force in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but that force rather decaying. *Wickliffe* was excommunicated by the Pope; and in the Council of *Conſtance* we find ſeveral propoſitions condemned,

[f] Bingham, 16. 3. 12.
[g] Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2. page 179. [h] Forbes, 12. 4. 41. &c.

condemned, in which he had aſſerted, that he ought to account[i] ſuch Excommunication for nothing.

By the time of the twenty-fifth Seſſion of the Council of Trent, the *Romaniſts* began to adopt ſome moderation and caution on this ſubject: and even to aſſign *experience* as the ground of their moderation: cùm experientia doceat ſi temerè, aut levibus ex rebus incutiatur, magis contemni quam formidari, et perniciem potiùs parere quàm ſalutem.—Still they retained the method of excommunication, in both degrees. Excommunicatus verò quicunque, ſi poſt legitimas monitiones non reſipuerit, non ſolùm ad *ſacramenta* et communionem fidelium ac *familiaritatem* non recipiatur, &c. but at laſt he may be proſecuted for *Hereſy*; which offence would be puniſhed by death.

While on the ſubject of the Romaniſts, I will juſt add, that their Sacrament of Penance, and particularly *Confeſſion*, ſuperſedes[k], in modern times, other kinds of diſcipline:—and that *Dupin*[l] makes no objection to this Article.

Since the Romaniſts appear to have been ſo moderate at the time when the *Reformed* Churches compiled their Confeſſions, we cannot expect to find in thoſe Confeſſions any great aſperity againſt the Church of Rome. That of *Augſburg*[m] refers to paſt grievances; but I do not perceive that any other does; except that of Wittemberg, in blaming the Romiſh Theory. Several of them ſeem deſirous to repreſent the Church of Chriſt as having more buſineſs with teaching, comforting, or kindly *rebuking*, than with excommunicating. His kingdom,

[i] Baxter on Councils, page 432.
[k] Burnet. [l] Third Append. to Moſheim.
[m] Syntagma, page 59.

dom, ſay they, is not of this world; the πολίτευμα of Chriſtians is in Heaven[n]. But I will mention a few particular remarks, which I made in running over the confeſſions of the reformed.—The *Helvetic* Confeſſion is very wary: cautious of plucking up Corn with the *Tares*.—The *Engliſh* (by Biſhop Jewel) is for removing *Scandals*, for the ſake of the good[o]: and underſtands, by the *Keys* (as the ancients did) the true ſenſe of Scripture.—The *Scotch* excludes from Sacraments by making *examination* neceſſary for admiſſion.—The *Dutch* is for diſcipline, and for rebukes from the Senate or *Preſbytery*. But gets off by ſaying, that all *will* go well when good *Elections* are made.—The Confeſſio *Argentinenſis* (Straſburg) declines ſeverity.—That of *Augſburg* enters fully into the difference between civil and eccleſiaſtical power, and mixed; is mild, but allows of expulſion, ſine *vi* humanâ, ſed verbo: it is for warding off *Hereſy*.—The *Saxon* holds the mild doctrine.—And that of *Wittemberg* is more intent on denying the rectitude of the *Papal* eccleſiaſtical government, than on defining a more perfect ſcheme[p].

The *Socinians*, in their Racovian Catechiſm, ſpeak as if they would *avoid* the *company* of an offender, and yet take ſome opportunity of admoniſhing him as a brother. Or if this does not reclaim him, then they would *baniſh* him from the Church of *Chriſt*, and no longer own him for a brother, but count him for an *Alien*[q].

I do not recollect anything in the time of *Henry VIII.* worth mentioning: private diſcipline ſeems

[n] John xviii. 36.—Phil. iii. 20.
[o] Syntagma, page 63. 116.
[p] For theſe paſſages, ſee Syntagma, page 156. 179. 235. 60. 98. 183. (the paging begins a ſecond time).
[q] De Eccleſiâ Chriſti, Cap. 3. page 346.

ſeems to have conſiſted in Confeſſion; and public, in burning Heretics.

In the reign of Edward VI. the Reformatio Legum takes very great notice of Excommunication; and gives Forms[r] of great *length*, conſidering the ſize of the whole Code of Laws. And there are two[s] ſhort chapters on the principal buſineſs of our Article, *encouraging* offenders under ſentence of excommunication.—The puniſhments ſeem very ſevere.

In one of the *Canons*[t] of James I. offenders are ordered to be denounced four times a year.

VI. When we come lower, we ſhould divide Engliſh Chriſtians into three ſorts; *Eraſtians*, *Puritans*, and *Moderate* Church of England men.

Some were called *Eraſtians*, from following the notions of one *Eraſtus*, a German, who died in 1582. He was a Phyſician, but wrote ſome treatiſes on Church-government. On Excommunication, and the power of the *Keys*. He reduces all Church power to *perſuaſion*; no one, he holds, ſhould be *kept* from the *Sacrament*, but only *perſuaded* that he ought not to receive it unworthily. Chriſtianity is offered to all.—As ſome proviſion muſt be made for eccleſiaſtical offences, he ranks them with *civil* ones; and holds, that all offences of every kind, are to be puniſhed by the civil Magiſtrate.—This idea was favoured, in the diſputes in the time of our Charles the Firſt, by ſome men of great character and ability; both in Parliament, and in the Aſſembly of Divines held in 1645.—*Selden*, *Whitlock*, and Dr. *Lightfoot*, are mentioned[u] as favouring it.

Oppoſite

[r] Page, or fol. 74. and 80.
[s] Cap. 6. 11. oppoſite page 77. 83.
[t] Canon 65. [u] Neal, Vol. 2. page 97.

Oppoſite to theſe were the *Puritans*, or *Preſbyterians*, who held, that excommunication ought to be only of a *ſpiritual* nature, and deprive a man only of ſpiritual[x] comforts; but that it was intirely in the hands of the *Church*, and wholly *independent* on the *civil* magiſtrate; and ought not to be adminiſtered by *Laymen*. A party of theſe, in 1645, made a ſtrong attempt to eſtabliſh, as their right, a power of excluding any Chriſtian from the Sacrament, ſubject to no control from the ſtate; which they were to exerciſe *jure divino*; the Aſſembly and the Parliament ſaw the neceſſity of preventing ſuch an imperium in imperio; and the Preſbyterians were diſappointed.

The third, *moderate* ſort of Engliſh Chriſtians allowed, with the Eraſtians, that a ſociety merely eccleſiaſtical had no power of touching perſon or property; and, with the Preſbyterians, that ſuch a ſociety is, in its nature, independent on the State; but affirmed, that it is wholly *impracticable* for an eccleſiaſtical ſociety to be compoſed of the ſubjects of any State, and to exiſt within that State, without connecting itſelf with the civil power; without borrowing from it ſtrength and force, and aſſiſting it with good ſentiments and principles, productive of obedience for conſcience ſake[y].

VII. He who keeps theſe three ſorts of Engliſh Chriſtians in his mind, will want very little farther information. It may not however be amiſs to mention the modern *Baptiſts*. They ſeem[z] to follow our Saviour's directions given Matt. xviii. 15—17. exactly, and with very good effect: no wonder; it is an admirable[a] plan: it is applied to differences

x Neal, Vol 1. page 354.—See alſo page 158.

y This ſubject is treated Book III. Chap. XIV.

z Wall, 4to. page 453.

a Dr. Prieſtley ſeems to ſpeak of it with pleaſure.—Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2. page 167.

differences between individuals; and if any man is guilty of ſcandalous immorality, he is excluded from the Brotherhood.—The Diſſenters complain of our want of ſtrictneſs in Church Diſcipline, and with reaſon: Dr. Wall laments it, yet makes as good an Apology as the Truth[b] will allow.

VIII. There has been ſomething greatly *diſtreſſing* in the caſe of thoſe, who were excommunicated by a Church, merely becauſe they preached *doctrines* contrary to its own, when they thought themſelves obliged in *Conſcience* to do ſo. To have ſuch people ſuffer all the rigours of excommunication, is to perpetuate every corruption, and to preclude all improvement.

It is as much the nature of religion to approach gradually towards perfection, as of anything elſe. This was the diſtreſs of *Wickliffe*[c] in the fourteenth Century, and of the *Puritans*[d] at the beginning of the ſeventeenth; and very cruel hardſhips they ſuffered. Some expedient ſhould have been invented to make a difference between criminals and conſcientious men. We now have one; *Toleration*[e]: and nothing can ſhew its excellence more clearly, than the diſtreſſes now mentioned. The Scripture ſays, "come out[f] of her;" quit a church which really appears eſſentially corrupt: But there was no way to *get* out, with tolerable ſafety, when there was no toleration: nor without making a party large enough to throw all things into confuſion.

In

[b] Wall, 4to. page 454.
[c] Wickliffe died in 1384.
[d] In 1604. Neal 1. page 429.—See Warb. Alliance, page 71;—Book 1. Chap. 5. Sect. 2.
[e] Book III. Chap. XIV. Sect. XV.
[f] Rev. xviii. 4.——2 Cor. vi. 17.

In Blackſtone's[g] Commentaries, we find, that both the leſs and the greater excommunication ſtill ſubſiſt in our own country. The leſs excluding from ſacraments; the greater from all Society.—The coercive power is lent by the common law; which excludes the excommunicated from all acts of *probus et legalis homo*; from the acts of Juryman, Witneſs, &c.—*Burn* gives us good information nn this matter.

I take Warburton's Alliance to be the Book which gives the beſt idea of the Theory of civil, eccleſiaſtical, and mixed power, and conſequently of Excommunication[h].

IX. From Hiſtory we deduce *Explanation.*

In the *title*, "*excommunicate* perſons," may mean perſons under either ſort of excommunication, the leſs or the greater:—the greater growing out of the leſs.

"Open denunciation"—refers to the *practice* already mentioned; our ſixty-fifth Canon was made[i] after our Article.

"Of the Church,"—what is meant by the church, appeared under the nineteenth and twentieth Articles; any particular church, conſidering itſelf as making a part of the univerſal church.—And the conduct of the ancient churches towards each other, ſuits our former accounts very well, as given in thoſe Articles.

"Rightly"—what we have to do, then, is built upon the ſuppoſition that a perſon is *rightly* excommunicated:—that may ſave us trouble. It would be a great hardſhip to be obliged to avoid any one whom we thought *injured.*—And

[g] Vol. 3. page 102. 4to. [h] See Index, and 2. 3. 3.

[i] The ninth Chapter of the Reformatio Legum, De Excommunicatione, is intitled, *Excommunicatorum denunciatio.*

And who, according to our Article, is to be *judge* but ourſelves[k]?

"Cut off," is a ſcriptural expreſſion.—Rom. ix. 3.—Gal. v. 12.—It frequently occurs, as appears from the Concordance. *Exciſion* we have had before.

"The unity of the church"—if a particular church is a conſtituent part of the univerſal Church, then cutting off from the *part*, is cutting off from the *whole*; from whatever link an inſect is driven, it is driven from the *chain*. Cyprian wrote, *De Unitate Eccleſiæ*. Alluſion is made to ſuch texts as John xvii. 11. 21, 22.—Eph. iv. 3. and 13.

"The *whole multitude* of the faithful,"—means all particular churches, conſtituting together the *univerſal* church; the denunciation uſed to be made to all churches within reach: as we have ſeen.

"As an Heathen and Publican,"—regarding any one as an *Heathen*, is regarding him as a *Man*; which is leaving him all the rights of *humanity*.—Regarding any one as a *Publican*, is not what we are obliged to in the *literal* ſenſe? we cannot be obliged to look upon an excommunicated perſon, as a collector of taxes; as an *exciſeman*, or cuſtom-houſe-officer: but only in that light, in which a Publican uſed to be regarded in our Saviour's time[l]. – Our Article is very indulgent in not ſaying, that

[k] Suppoſe a man thought, with the Eraſtians, that *no man* was rightly cut off:—need he ſcruple to aſſent to this Article? would it not, indeed, be to him *a dead Letter?* according to Book III. Chap. IX. Sect. IX.?

[l] It is only fair to take the meaning of the word *Heathen* in the ſame way; in that light in which the *Jews* conſidered it: ſtill from the ſtory of the Good Samaritan, an Heathen is a *man*.

that we are to *avoid*[m] an excommunicated perſon; or refuſe him our *company* on every occaſion: or help to drive him from the Lord's table.—Our Saviour ſate down at meat with Publicans and Sinners, when his buſineſs was to endeavour to reform them[n].

"Until," ſhews that the exciſion here ſpoken of is not *final*, except the offender chuſes to make it ſo:—his continuance in his ſtate of diſgrace, muſt be ſolely owing to his refuſing to undergo the puniſhment, or penance, to which he is ſentenced.

"Openly"—implies *notification*, ſuch as was uſed when the ſentence had paſſed:—the Article ſays, "by *open* denunciation."—The excommunicated are not to be ſuffered to inſinuate themſelves *gradually* into the church: as they were excluded, ſo they are to be received, by *judicial* proceſs.

x. Now proceed we to our *Proof*.—And what is to be proved?—'Suppoſe a perſon rightly ſuſpended from the uſe of Chriſtian ordinances, every Chriſtian ought to be cautious of fruſtrating ſuch diſcipline.' This muſt be clear enough in itſelf; but ſtill our buſineſs ſeems to be, to take a view of what the *Scripture* ſays on the ſubject; either on the buſineſs of *ſetting aſide* thoſe whoſe continuance in Society is likely to do harm: or on the nature of our *behaviour towards* them, when they *are* ſet aſide.—I will take ſome paſſages in the order in which they lie, without dividing them into two heads.—Matt. xviii. 15—18.—Rom. xvi. 17.—1 Cor. v. 4, 5. 7. 9. 11. 13.—1 Cor. xv. 33.—xvi. 22.—2 Cor. ii. 10.—2 Cor. vi. 17.—2 Theſſ.

[m] The *title* mentions *avoiding*, but no preciſe degree of it; and we do not ſubſcribe to the *titles* of the Articles.

[n] Matt. ix. 10.——xi. 19.

2 Theſſ. iii. 6. 14.—2 Tim. ii. 16—18.—Titus iii. 10, 11.—2 John i. 10, 11.

XI. I ſhould think that theſe texts muſt ſatisfy any man, that Chriſtian Churches have good reaſon for avoiding, in a conſiderable degree, thoſe under ſentence of excommunication, when there is no ground to ſuſpect the ſentence to be *unjuſt*.—Some of the expreſſions want conſidering; but they are intelligible enough to be real *proofs*; ſome of them were very ſparingly uſed by the ancients[o]; probably, becauſe their meaning was too *indefinite* for them to be uſed without ſome comment, or doubt; and perhaps becauſe they ſeemed too *terrible* to be uſed by Man.

I will ſay frankly in what light ſome of them ſtrike *me*.

As to Matt. xviii. 15—17. It ſeems at firſt to relate only to *private* wrongs. Your Brother offends you; you are firſt to *expoſtulate* with him; if that does not ſucceed, you are to deſire a few friends, men of good character, to be *witneſſes* of your next expoſtulation; ſomething may have been miſunderſtood:—they are not prejudiced againſt the offender, as you may be ſuppoſed to be: nor he againſt them: he may not be *aſhamed* to ſubmit to *them*, though he may to *you*. If this fail, ſtate the caſe to the Εκκλησια, to ſome reputable ſociety; perhaps to thoſe with whom you commonly aſſociate in religious[p] worſhip; and deſire their *arbitration*.

[o] Bingham, 16. 2. 16.

[p] *Selden* ſays, the *Eccleſiæ* were "courts of Law which then ſate at Jeruſalem;"—(he ſays this in the Houſe of Commons, in 1645;—Neal, Vol. 2. quarto, page 194)—But were they *Jewiſh* Courts? then 1 Cor. vi. 1. or rather the ſame *principle*, would be *againſt* referring to them: and there could not be any *Chriſtian* Courts of Law ſo ſoon.—It does not ſeem likely, that Chriſt ſhould ſend his new Diſciples to *Jewiſh* Courts of *Law*.—Yet it may be ſaid he *had* no Diſciples; or none formed into

tration. If they favour your opinion, you may have confidence in it: and having done every thing in your power towards a reconciliation, you may give it up as *deſperate*, except your adverſary makes ſome ſubmiſſion. And you may avoid the Society of him who was once your Brother, in the ſame manner in which the ſtrict Jews avoid the company of Idolaters, and of thoſe diſreputable perſons whom the Romans are compelled to employ in collecting their *tribute*.

I uſed to think this direction belonged only to individuals; but the words which immediately follow, give it a different appearance. "Verily I ſay unto you, Whatſoever *ye* ſhall bind on earth, ſhall be bound in Heaven; and whatſover ye ſhall looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in Heaven."—Theſe words muſt be a declaration to religious *Society*. They had indeed been before addreſſed[q] to *Peter* only; but with ſome previous declarations; as, that the *Church* of Chriſt ſhould be founded on a rock, that no powers ſhould be able to "prevail againſt it:" and that Chriſt would give unto Peter "the *Keys* of the Kingdom of Heaven;" all which things ſhew, that Peter was to bind and to looſe as a ruler in the *Church*.—It now therefore ſeems to me, that, though no plan can be better calculated for deciding differences amongſt individuals than the one here propoſed, yet an offence, when transferred from the judgment of a few friends to a *community*, might be changed from a private into a *public wrong*, and therefore when ſentence

into a *Body*. But might not Chriſtians, as ſoon as they acted ſocially, have ſomething *correſponding* to Jewiſh Courts?—If they had, the term would be uſed for them. Compare Matt. v. 21, 22. Still recourſe is to be had to *arbitration*, of men in ſome ſort of public capacity.

[q] Matt. xvi. 19.

ſentence had been pronounced, *all men* might be equally obliged to treat the offender "as an Heathen man and a Publican." Moreover, a good Chriſtian may not only be offended by wrongs done to *himſelf*, but by *any* bad actions which will bring diſgrace upon the *Church*, or upon *Religion*. And the proceſs laid down Matt. xviii. 15—17. —would be equally applicable to all kinds of offences.

The terms *binding* and *looſing*, and "the *Keys* of the kingdom of Heaven," have occaſioned many diſſertations, and much controverſy. It ſeems to me as if it were no way neceſſary to have a preciſe idea of their meaning.—For whom ſhould it be wanted? not for the *Governors* of the Church; they can but do their beſt in uſing their authority for the good of mankind:—not for the *governed*; enough is intelligible to convince them, that God will *ratify* the acts of thoſe, who do every thing faithfully and modeſtly as his *Agents*. A ſhort and *figurative* commiſſion, is not likely to *define* nicely the extent and nature of the authority which it confers; neither does ſuch defining ſeem to fall in with the uſual methods of Scripture.—Having the *Keys* of the kingdom of Heaven appears to me to mean, having a power to *baptize* and *admit* men into the Chriſtian Religion. But the Chriſtian Religion, though frequently called the Kingdom of Heaven, leads, of courſe, all things going on regularly, to the kingdom of Heaven *above*. As to *binding* and *looſing*, let it ſignify what it will, if God binds in Heaven what his Church binds on Earth, and looſes in Heaven what his Church looſes on Earth, He *confirms the acts* of his Church; which is our principal concern. Let *binding* mean *tying*, or excommunicating, or *obliging* us to do a thing, or let it mean

mean *forbidding*[r], the whole ſentence comes to the ſame thing. God *ratifies* what his Miniſters enact.

XII. Of Rom. xvi. 17. we may remark, that if a Church was well conſtituted, it might with propriety take cognizance of *cauſing diviſions*, as an offence or *crime*; and he who, by a Jury, or Council, or other Judges, ſhould be found *guilty* of cauſing diviſions, might juſtly be puniſhed; and particularly, *avoided*[s].

XIII. The next part of Scripture to which we come, is the fifth Chapter of the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians. In this, the Apoſtle repeatedly orders an *offender* to be *caſt out* of the Church: what kind of perſon he was, and what was the nature of his offence, Mr. Locke has ſufficiently explained[t]. But I do not perceive that he has given any opinion with regard to the expreſſion, *delivering the Offender unto Satan.* Here the whole church of Corinth, including St. Paul's vote by Proxy, as it were, are to deliver an offender to Satan, in the *name* and by the *power* of Chriſt. In 1 Tim. i. 20. St. Paul ſays, that he himſelf delivered two offenders to Satan. The end and purpoſe for which the Church of Corinth were to deliver over their offender, was, "for the deſtruction of the *Fleſh*, that the *Spirit* [might] be *ſaved* in the day of the Lord Jeſus."—The end for which St. Paul delivered Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan, was, that they might "learn not to *blaſpheme*."—Now, how much evil ſhould be referred to Satan, is *arbitrary:* to reject the general belief of the agency of

[r] Wotton's Miſna, Vol. 1. page 309, &c.

[s] It might be conſidered how far this offence of cauſing diviſions would reſemble promoting *Sedition*; ſeducing military perſons from their allegiance, bringing a malicious proſecution; offering a frivolous petition to our Houſe of Commons, &c.

[t] Locke on 1 Cor. v.

of ſpirits, is narrow-minded, and philoſophy falſely ſo called;—to refer to them particular events in a literal ſenſe, is ſuperſtition; but the uſual indefinite manner of referring evil to them, meaning that they *may* cauſe evil, you know not how, depends upon cuſtom, education, fancy. The *Jews*, religious at the ſame time and ignorant, referred, in their language, many[u] events to them: and the Apoſtles had no reaſon to change their expreſſions. Indeed, *Wickliffe* refers as many things to the agency of *Sathanas*, as any Jews ever did.—The *faſhion* now is, to take no notice of Spirits as the promoters of evil, or of good. Not that we differ from our predeceſſors as to any *facts*, but only as to modes of expreſſion.—St. Paul would ſpeak to thoſe who were accuſtomed to refer evil to Satan, and would therefore naturally uſe their language. Inſtances are numerous. It would be natural for him to call depriving any one of Religion, *delivering him to Satan*[x]. This may be illuſtrated by Acts xxvi. 18. and 1 Pet. v. 8.—As converting any one to the Chriſtian Religion, was turning him "from the power of Satan," ſo ſuſpending him from the uſe and exerciſe of that Religion, was delivering him back to the ſame power. And Satan, being always, in men's notions, like a fierce and hungry lion, prowling about, ſeeking whom he might devour, would be ready to ſeize upon the prey delivered to him.—Yet this language about Satan was not uſed as if every thing ſaid was known to be plain *fact*; but only in a way of *eloquence*, when ſome *ſentimental* effect was to be produced; ſome good principle encouraged, ſome bad one diſcouraged[y].

But

[u] Art. x. Sect. l. and other places there mentioned.

[x] See Concordance, *Satan*.

[y] Our reaſoning here is only an exemplification of the elements laid down in the tenth and ſeventeenth Articles.

But why is ſuch language uſed, as that a man was to be delivered to Satan "for the deſtruction of the *Fleſh?*"—or that he might learn not to *blaſpheme?*—"The *fleſh*" is often uſed, in Scripture for the *fleſhly*[z] *appetites*; and nothing could have a ſtronger tendency to break their force, than the mortification of being diſgracefully baniſhed from honourable ſociety; from thoſe who had ſhewn conſtant fidelity and affection; and conſigned to ignominious ſolitude.

The offender of whom the expreſſion is uſed, is called the *Fornicator*.—The ſame kind of mortification, would lower a man's ſpirits, ſo as to take from him all inclination to *blaſpheme*: abuſive language proceeds from an inſolent and haughty ſpirit. (2 Pet. ii. 18.)—Perhaps there is nothing which has a greater effect upon a feeling mind, than a conſciouſneſs of having loſt the eſteem of the worthy and benevolent; than being an object of general averſion or contempt; even though ſoftened by gentleneſs and goodneſs. Few men are ſo hardened as to be able to bear being generally ſhunned[a] and

[z] Rom. viii. 1—13. particularly ver. 5 & 6. and ſee Parkhurſt's fifth ſenſe of Σαρξ.—The fleſh ſometimes ſignifies the *Body*; and bodily ills are aſcribed to *Satan*. Job i. and ii. 2.—2 Cor. xii. 7. (ſore eyes):—Ambroſe makes σκολοψ mean *caſtigatio*; ſee Forbes, 12. 3. 3.

Being in the *fleſh*, is being in *this Life*. Phil. i. 24.—Col. ii. 1. 5.—(All fleſh, means all *men*)—ſo 1 Cor. vii. 28. troubles *in the Fleſh*, Mr. Locke calls *worldly* troubles. I ſuppoſe melancholy or *deſpair* might be called troubles in the fleſh: I do not think our interpretation of, delivering to Satan, would be materially hurt, by taking *fleſh*, in any of theſe ſenſes.—Something was ſaid of φρονημα σαρκος, Rom. viii. 6. under Art. IX. Sect. XXV.

[a] Our familiar language ſays, being ſhunned, &c. *is the Devil*: ſuppoſe any one was to ſet on criticiſing that expreſſion grammatically, as a literal one!—Yet perhaps it would bear criticiſm as well as, *delivering to Satan?*—This brings to mind that other familiar phraſe, of ſending to Coventry, the moſt ſevere of puniſhments to ſome diſpoſitions.

and avoided.—This mortification, if it took a right courſe, would put the *Spirit* in the beſt way to "be ſaved in the day of the Lord Jeſus."

XIV. On 1 Cor. xv. 33. I need make no remarks; it agrees with 1 Cor. v. 6, 7. which is part of St. Paul's argument for caſting out the Corinthian Fornicator.

And 1 Cor. xvi. 22. has been diſcuſſed under the eighteenth Article.

2 Cor. ii. 10. is an argument in favour of puniſhing in the name and by the authority of Chriſt, becauſe it proves that *forgiveneſs* may be in his name; and forgiveneſs implies previous puniſhment.

2 Cor. vi. 17. is ſometimes, I think, uſed for an argument; but it only orders Chriſtians to ſeparate themſelves from[b] *Idolaters*, not from diſorderly Chriſtians.

2 Theſſ. iii. 6. 14. ſeems intelligible, and may ſerve as a comment on 1 Tim. i. 20.

2 Tim. ii. 16—18. is not ſo much a proof in itſelf, as an auxiliary to 1 Tim. i. 20. *Hymeneus* being mentioned in both.—The bad effects of religious error are ſtrongly expreſſed.

Titus iii. 10, 11. ſerves to ſhew, that mere falſe *doctrine* may be a ſufficient reaſon for ſeparation.—*Unity of Doctrine* was proved in the third Book, to be neceſſary for obtaining the ends of *religious Society*.

2 John, verſes 10, 11. ſhews, that the ſeparation for falſe doctrine, is to be extended to *domeſtic* familiarity: private *conferences* have perverted many: compare 2 Tim. iii. 6. Not that men are always to

[b] This agrees with *Selden's* obſervation, Neal, Vol. 2. page 194: only he would make *all* the ſeparations enjoined, to be of this kind.—Selden's ſpeech was mentioned before; Sect. XI.

to refuſe their attention to religious argument; but men are not to liſten to ſuppoſed Hereſy *lightly*, without *caution* and *deliberation*.—I mean not to make any caution for one religion more than another. The proviſion here made, is for the *People:*—they were diſtinguiſhed from *Philoſophers* in our ſecond Book.

XV. As we have ſeen the authority on which Chriſtian offenders are ſuſpended from the uſe of the ordinances of religion, and avoided by their brethren, we ſhould take ſome notice of thoſe texts of Scripture, which may diſpoſe us to *reſtore* him to his former ſtate, in caſe of his ſincere repentance and humiliation;—as the reſtoration to favour ſeems to make an eſſential part of our Article.

Avoiding a perſon, with a right temper of mind, muſt fall very far ſhort of depriving him of the rights of *humanity*. It ought to expreſs no bitterneſs, or acrimony; but a kind *concern*, a benevolent ſolicitude, an earneſtneſs to rectify every thing wrong, an anxious wiſh for the return of a truly Chriſtian diſpoſition. The prayers of *Cyprian*[c] would be, no doubt, expreſſive of all this. Deteſtation of a crime, is always to be diſtinguiſhed from hatred of the Criminal.—From 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13. it appears, that a Chriſtian wife may live with an *heathen huſband*: therefore taking a perſon as an *Heathen*, does not extend to diſſolving the ſeveral relations of human life.—St. Paul, as before mentioned, ordered an offender to be excluded from the Church of Corinth; but in giving his order he ſaid no more than what he thought *neceſſary* to make the Corinthians execute it. And when he found they *had* executed it, nothing can exceed the tenderneſs which he ſhewed, leſt any *malevolent*

[c] Forbes, 12. 3. 2.

malevolent ſeverity ſhould be uſed, or the offender "ſwallowed[d] up with *over-much ſorrow*." He became *diffident* of his own upright judgment, and extremely *cautious* leſt he ſhould be *tempted* (tempted by *Satan*) to indulge his well-grounded indignation ſo as to *delay* his forgiveneſs (as the miniſter of Chriſt) longer than neceſſity required. It is with this idea that he introduces the words, "if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your ſakes forgave I it, in the perſon of Chriſt; leſt *Satan* ſhould get an *advantage* of us; for we are not ignorant of his devices[e]."

After citing 2 Theſſ. iii. 14. in order to enable us to puniſh, we ſhould read the next verſe, to prevent all needleſs ſeverity of puniſhment; and all uſe of it on a wrong principle.—As a general plan of puniſhing Chriſtian brethren, we may, laſtly, take Gal. vi. 1.

So much for direct proof.

XVI. In the way of indirect proof I will only propoſe *one objection*. Is it to be conceived, that when a man is cut off from the Church, he really becomes, in all reſpects, an *Heathen?*—that would be, according to what has been ſaid under the thirteenth and eighteenth Articles, a thing greatly to be dreaded. To this queſtion I anſwer, God muſt finally judge of that; there will be no wrong at his Tribunal; yet as it is taken for granted that He confirms the acts of his Miniſters when they *admit* men into Chriſtianity, is it to be conceived, that he will make them void, when they exclude? It ſeems a thing which offenders have great *reaſon to fear*. Even ſuppoſing that they are excluded for

[d] 2 Cor. ii. 7.

[e] 2 Cor. ii. 10, 11.—No one can doubt the delicacy and kindneſs of St. Paul's ſentiments, who reads Mr. Locke on this paſſage.

for what is in itſelf an indifferent action, yet deſtroying or weakening that *authority*, which has been conſtituted for the general good, is ſurely a fault, and one of great importance. Nay, I ſhould ſay, that if a man was bonâ fide excommunicated for a *right* or *good action*, performed for conſcience ſake, yet if he did not do all in his *power* (ſo as not to violate *duty*) both to *avoid offending* the ſacred Magiſtrate, and to *reconcile* himſelf to thoſe in authority, he would ſtill, though unfortunate in this life, be puniſhable in the next.

XVII. In making an *Application*, we may diſpenſe with a new form of aſſent, and alſo with mutual conceſſions: but it is not eaſy to quit the Article without one word concerning *Improvement*. I fear it is wanting both in *Theory* and *Practice*. —Our eccleſiaſtical *Laws* were formed at various *times*, and on various occaſions: ſo that ſome of them cannot now be equitably enforced, in their full extent; and to adjuſt them to the preſent times, by a compariſon of circumſtances, would require uncommon ability. This gives room for too much ſeverity in thoſe who are inclined, or intereſted, to be ſevere; and for too much lenity in the timid and indolent. The mere attempt to make a new Code, would be attended with good; as it would make our ſpiritual intereſts to be better underſtood than they are at preſent, more worthily eſteemed, and more effectually promoted.

With regard to *practice*, I believe every religious man will allow, that the eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrates, whoſe buſineſs it is to viſit and correct the Church, frequently do not do it effectually. And what is the reaſon?—Becauſe they have imperfect laws; and becauſe they have not the firm ſupport of either the great or the ſmall? What could *Hildebrand* himſelf do in ſuch a ſituation? The

Great

Great are labouring to have all things work together, either for a ſecure majority in Parliament, or for perſonal influence, or command[f]. Eccleſiaſtics are not to make the Reformation of all men their ſole purpoſe, becauſe the Great are their *Patrons*; they muſt not be *ungrateful* to thoſe who *gave* them the dignities they poſſeſs:—gave them? is that a *gift* which is conferred by *patronage?* is not patronage a *truſt*, a power of *naming*, for the ſole end of promoting the *public* good?

But as the Great *miſtake* the nature and conſequences of their power, the *inferior orders* are *careleſs* and negligent about theirs; they think not of their own real value and importance. Have they not the power of *excommunication* in themſelves, in a very great degree? and will even the *Great* think it *prudent* to act againſt the united ſenſe, if plainly rational and virtuous, of the generality of the people? It is not difficult to ſee, how, in this way, one evil begets a number.—However, in like manner, one good might beget a number, if we could once ſet the procreation a going.—Might not our eccleſiaſtical Judges imitate our civil ones? they have no appearance of any reſpect of perſons: They hang the wealthy[g] *Peer* as a common felon.—But they are made, it will be urged, *independent:* by what power? could not the ſame give independence to judges eccleſiaſtical?—but we muſt not loſe ourſelves in *Utopian* ſpeculations.

I conclude

[f] I fear there are too many inſtances at preſent of Patrons embezzling the property of the Church; by making bargains to pay a ſtipulated ſum inſtead of tithes; or by taking the Church Lands into their own occupation, and confounding them with their own; or by other unjuſtifiable meaſures.

[g] Earl Ferrers.

I conclude with the teſtimony of Sir William Blackſtone in favour of the *higheſt* eccleſiaſtical Judges, leſt what I have ſaid ſhould direct any one's attention towards *them*. He acknowledges[h], "to the honour of the ſpiritual courts," that "juſtice is in general" "ably and impartially adminiſtered in thoſe tribunals, eſpecially of the ſuperior kind[i]."

[h] Book 3. Chap. 7.

[i] This laſt Section was omitted at Lecture; chiefly for want of time. It did not afterwards ſeem proper for the *beginning* of a Lecture; and was not neceſſary for Students.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXXIV.

OF THE TRADITIONS OF THE CHURCH.

IT is not neceſſary, that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly like; for at all times they have been diverſe, and may be changed, according to the diverſities of countries, times, and men's manners, ſo that nothing be ordained againſt God's Word. Whoſoever through his private judgment, willingly and purpoſely doth openly break the traditions and ceremonies of the Church, which be not repugnant to the Word of God, and be ordained and approved by common authority, ought to be rebuked openly (that other may fear to do the like) as he that offendeth againſt the common Order of the Church, and hurteth the authority of the Magiſtrate, and woundeth the conſciences of the weak brethren.

Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and aboliſh ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, ſo that all things be done to edifying.

---

1. On examining this Article, it ſeems as if our beſt plan would be, to join the *Hiſtory* and the *Explanation* together. Eſpecially conſidering what has been already ſaid under the ſixth and twentieth Articles.

II. In the *Title* we find the word *Tradition*;—it means here, traditional *practice*; in the ſixth Article it meant, traditional *doctrine*. A *ſyſtem* of traditional practice, ſeems to bear ſome analogy to what is called *common Law*. In the Article, "*Traditions* and *Ceremonies*" come together: they mean ſomething of the ſame kind of thing; and are *joined* here, as they are frequently, in order to ſhew what *ſort* of Tradition is meant.—A *ceremony* enjoined by a *written* law, would not at firſt be called a Tradition, yet what are called Traditions, are ſometimes, perhaps, after having been neglected, enjoined by written Laws. Generally, they are of too little importance to be written, and from that, their name has come; yet their name might nevertheleſs come to be the *common* name for rites and ceremonies, and cuſtoms, and all *human* religious ordinances. The laſt clauſe of our Article has the expreſſion, "ceremonies *or rites*."—The term *tradition* comes from *ſcripture*; as appears, not only from mention of *Jewiſh* traditions, but from 1 Cor. xi. 2. and 2 Theſſ. ii. 15. and iii. 6.

The Confeſſion of *Augſburg* conſiders Traditions as *locorum ac temporum diſcrimina:* the *Saxon* calls them, Rites inſtituted by *human* authority; the *Bohemian* mentions *cuſtoms* as well as rites[a].

But though traditions and ceremonies may be of the ſame kind, yet the word ceremony does not uſually convey ſo extenſive an idea as tradition. If we even take ceremony ſo as to include *Liturgies*, &c. it confines the attention to preſent times; and generally it ſuggeſts only things viſible: but the word tradition, carries the mind back to paſt times,

[a] *Rites* ſeem to come nearer Traditions, than ceremonies do. *Ritus*, quaſi, *ratus mos* (Ainſworth, from an old Grammarian), may include any *cuſtoms*; more than ceremony does.—See Lord King's Primitive Church, part 2. Chap. 10. or page 198.

times, and ſuggeſts various inſtitutions, which many do not diſtinguiſh from ſuch as are of *divine* authority. In order to ſee how many of our religious inſtitutions come under the idea of traditions, we ſhould imagine ourſelves to aboliſh, one after another, all religious obſervances, which are not expreſly *commanded* by *divine* law. Some would diſappear only in part, but others totally.—The Confeſſions of the reformed Churches reckon the great *Feſtivals* as traditions; ſuch as Chriſtmas, Eaſter, &c. and even *Sundays*; and morning and evening *prayers*. *Faſt-days* are alſo mentioned in the number, and Barclay ſays, that *Infant-Baptiſm* is "a mere human tradition." And all *Pſalmody*, and what we call *Choir-ſervice*, is inſtanced in by the Confeſſion of Augſburg[b].—But I only mention here what is ſufficient to *enlarge* our idea of traditions to its proper extent. Varieties will come by and by.

The reformed Confeſſions lay down their doctrine about Traditions, with great care and ſolemnity. One may ſee, that it muſt be an important matter to them to ſet aſide a number of Romiſh obſervances, and that without weakening the reverence of the people for ſuch as they thought it right to retain. They muſt do it in the face of their enemy's batteries, who would be attacking them with the Canon-Law, decretals of Popes, and all the moſt powerful artillery of human authority.—The Saxon Confeſſion is ſo ſerious as to end with a ſolemn *prayer*.

III. "It

[b] It is eaſy to give *inſtances*; but the difficulty is, by *definition*, to diſtinguiſh *univerſally* a *mutable* from an immutable rite:—is the *water* in Baptiſm a mutable rite, as Socinus ſays? is the *Cup* a mutable rite, in the Lord's Supper, as the Romaniſts ſay? (Trent Cat. Sect. 70. or rather Trent Council, Seſſ. 21. Cap. 2.)—Barclay's expreſſion is in his Apology, page 355. Edit. Birm.

III. "It is not *neceſſary* that Traditions," &c. —this rather ſeems to imply, that uniformity of Traditions is *deſirable*, whenever it becomes *practicable:* which ſeems farther to appear from the words *utterly alike:* they imply, I think, the more like, the better. The uniformity of ceremonies was mentioned in the third Book[c].

"In all places,"—at any one time.

IV. "*For* at all times they *have been* diverſe."

The *For* implies, that experience of the diverſity of Traditions, is an argument to prove, that ſameneſs is not neceſſary.—And the argument is ſtrong enough for the purpoſe; eſpecially if we take a time near the firſt publication of Chriſtianity. I do not think we are intended to compare different times; but only different places at the ſame time: indeed we may firſt take any one time, and afterwards any other time; without limit. If this be a right idea, we cannot ſay *here*, that the Jews had more Traditions than the Chriſtians: though that obſervation may have weight in another argument.

"They have been *diverſe*"—Here a large field opens upon us.—Traditions, or human inſtitutions, auxiliary to Divine, are congenial to human nature. A mere general principle of Piety would be rude and ſluggiſh: would want drawing out and exerciſing; good ſentiments die away, if not frequently brought into action:—human inſtitutions are required to furniſh occaſions; ſome ſocial, ſome ſolitary, ſome compoſed of both ſorts.

Occaſions muſt return periodically; muſt remind men of ſome events, which will move them.—Social occaſions of exerciſing religious ſentiments, muſt be furniſhed and filled up with employments of body and mind, ſuited to their end and purpoſe: all

[c] Book III. Chap V. Sect. II.

all our beſt and fineſt taſtes and feelings are to be ſet in motion, and made ſubſervient to Religion; our love of Truth, our reliſh of order; our taſte for beauty, ſublimity, harmony, are to be ſolicited, engaged, intereſted: our paſſions are to be thrown into a devout courſe, and to have objects preſented, which will excite and inflame them.

This will give ſome idea of the end and deſign of human religious inſtitutions, as common to all men.—But in what a variety of ways may this end be accompliſhed! to trace them out in the *Heathen*, *Jewiſh*, and *Chriſtian* religions, would be a work of time.

Heathens will be allowed, at any one time, to have had a great diverſity of religious rites and inſtitutions.

The *Jews* had a great number of ordinances preſcribed by Jehovah, and by his Miniſters; theſe are not to our purpoſe; but they had what they called *Traditions*; not properly of divine authority; their *Talmud* exiſted orally long before it was collected into a Book: and about theſe traditions they had different and contending[d] *parties*.

Chriſtians had very few injunctions from divine authority, in compariſon of the number required for carrying on a ſocial, regular religion; for teaching, praying, nouriſhing and animating religious ſentiments. They might have an outline, but each ſet or ſociety of Chriſtians ſupplied all the internal ſtrokes according to its ruling genius and turn. No wonder they differed; the wonder would have been if they had *not* differed. Indeed it is impoſſible to conceive, that they ſhould not. Every difference of judgment, education, habit, taſte, ſituation, would produce a difference in what we call Traditions. Nay, there would be ſo many openings

[d] Art. VI. Sect. III.

openings for variation, that if there had but been one diſpoſition, the chances would have been infinite againſt a perfect ſameneſs or uniformity.

But let us be more particular; I mean, with regard to Chriſtians.

v. I might read you the opening of Tertullian's Book de Coronâ militis; but as his Latin is by no means perſpicuous, I prefer giving you the tranſlation from Wall's Book on[e] Infant-Baptiſm. —*Eaſter* has been celebrated according to different rules; and thoſe who wanted to have Eaſter-day on the fourteenth day after the New Moon, whether Sunday or not, were called[f] Quartodecimans.

The twentieth Canon of the Council of *Nice* orders Chriſtians to *ſtand* during prayer. Though perhaps *uniformity* was rather the end in view, than any particular poſture; it might be more eaſy to make *all* ſtand than all kneel.—There is ſomething in the Canon like this, ut omnia *ſimiliter* fiant.—Socrates is quoted by the Helvetic Confeſſion as ſpeaking of the diverſity here meant, and Biſhop Jewel ſays, that Auguſtin complained of the too great number of ceremonies in his time. We have two Epiſtles of Auguſtin to *Januarius* on the ſubject of variety of ordinances, ceremonies, traditions, in which he ſhews his uſual ingenuouſneſs and liberality of ſentiment.—Januarius had wiſhed to know what he ſhould do about feſtivals and rites, in different *places* where different cuſtoms prevailed: Auguſtin's anſwer ſeems much to our purpoſe[g]. "Alia verò quæ per loca terrarum regioneſque

[e] Wall, page 480, quarto, or Part 2. Chap. 9. Sect. 4.

[f] See Epiphan. Hær. Τεσσαρες καιδεκατιται. —— Lardner's Works, Vol. 2. page 243, 244.——Lardner, Vol. 4. page 306. *Aërians* did not keep Eaſter at all, nor any other Feſtivals, or Faſts.

[g] Auguſtin. ad Januar. Epiſt. (ſeu Lib.) 1. Cap. 2. Edit. Antv. 1700. Tom. 2. (in Vol. 1.) page (or column) 94.

regioneſque variantur, ſicuti eſt quòd alii jejunant Sabbato, alii non; alii quotidiè communicant corpori et ſanguini Domini, alii certis diebus accipiunt. Alibi nullus dies prætermittitur quo non offeratur[h], alibi ſabbato tantùm *et* Dominico, alibi tantùm Dominico. Et ſi quid aliud hujuſmodi animadverti poteſt, totum hoc genus rerum *liberas* habet obſervationes: nec diſciplina ulla eſt in his melior, gravi prudentique Chriſtiano, quàm ut eo modo agat, quo agere viderit *Eccleſiam* ad quam fortè devenerit. Quod enim neque contra *fidem*, neque contra bonos *mores* eſſe convincitur, *indifferenter* eſt habendum; et propter eorum inter quos vivitur Societatem, ſervandum eſt."

The *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches have always differed in many obſervances, though both under the ſame Roman Emperor. Under the twenty-fourth Article we got a glimpſe of Aſiatic and African Chriſtians: they differ much in rites and ceremonies, or in what our preſent Article calls Traditions, from the Chriſtians of Europe.

In later times more *Canons* have been made by Councils for inferior inſtitutions, than uſed to be made anciently: but ſome Romiſh Canons have grown *obſolete* at Rome[i]; ſome (of different ages) have been ſuſpected as not *genuine*; and thoſe which are, or have been, received, prove the diverſity for which we are contending. Nay, Rome itſelf allows of diverſity, ſo that it be not againſt the Canon

[h] I fancy this is making offerings for the *dead*. See Lardner under *Aërius*. A. D. 360. Works, Vol. 4. page 306.—Μη δειν, φησι, προσφερειν ὑπερ προκεκοιμημενων.——*Tertullian* confirms this; ſee the paſſage juſt now referred to, Wall, page 480.—— "We give our oblations every year for the dead on the day of their martyrdom."

[i] The circumſtances here mentioned appear from the Confeſſions of the reformed Churches, particularly that of Augſburg. —See alſo Burnet on the Article.

Canon Law.—Of diverſity of Traditions *ſince* the Reformation, I need ſay nothing at preſent[k]. Something was ſaid under the twentieth Article.

VI. "And may be changed"—it is not ſaid *by whom*;—there *may* be a competent authority; what it is, may be ſpecified by and by: this is the *Theory*. With regard to *practice*, Dr. Powell informs us, that "nothing is plainly[l] wrong but change;" but we muſt interpret him by his context: he is ſpeaking of an ordinary ſtate of things, in ſome one place; whereas we are, in our minds, comparing different places; and when change of traditions is recommended, or allowed, in any one place, it is ſuppoſed to be made on ſome extraordinary occaſion.

Indeed, if we attended only to the expreſſions which follow, we muſt judge, that the Article has in view *differing*, at any one time, rather than changing, that is, more than differing at different times. However, if it is intended to juſtify the changing of *Romiſh* ceremonies, as I ſuppoſe it may, its chief meaning is, that traditions, or human modes of executing divine Laws, may, at the time when they are *inſtituted*, aſſume different forms according to different circumſtances.

VII. The different circumſtances mentioned, are, "diverſities of *Countries*, *times*, and men's *manners*."

Countries,—*regionum*; we ſhould perhaps now commonly expreſs the idea by *Climates*, though climate in ſtrictneſs, according to its etymology, makes

[k] One might look at the end of Queen Elizabeth's Preface to her Advertiſements (or Articles) of 1564: Sparrow's Collection, page 123.—"Temporal orders meer *eccleſiaſtical*," means the ſame with the *traditiones Eccleſiaſticæ*, in the Title to our thirty-fourth Article.—Indeed all the things enjoined in theſe Advertiſements are *Traditions*, in the ſenſe of our Church.

[l] Sermons, page 31.

makes only a difference of North and South.—The manner of *baptizing* may differ in hot and cold climates, or regions; immerſion ſuits hot climates better, and ſprinkling, cold. In the *Greek* church, a *Fan* is preſented to the Deacon in the ceremony of Ordination, becauſe the Deacon's buſineſs is to drive away from the Holy Elements, thoſe inſects with which Eaſtern countries are infeſted.—Monteſquieu ſays, to enjoin abſtinence in general, is reaſonable; to enjoin particular ſorts of abſtinence, is not ſo, in an extenſive religion[m].

"*Times*"—this word is not in Biſhop Sparrow's copy, though *temporum* is in his Latin.—Whereas Bennet, in his Collation, has no inſtance of *times* being wanting, but mentions a MS where *temporum* is only in the margin, written with a red-lead pencil.—Here the Region is given, as we ſay, and the *times* are ſuppoſed to vary.—Holland was once ſubject to the Spaniſh Government: ſuppoſe a ſimple ſmall republic to ſucceed a ſplendid monarchy, the ſame traditions would not ſuit both.

"*Manners*," may vary, in a given region, and in given times. Monteſquieu[n] obſerves, that there ought to be more Feſtivals where leſs labour is required to produce plenty. And that Conſtantine ordered Sunday to be kept holy in Cities, and not in Villages; becauſe though labour in cities is uſeful, in villages it is neceſſary[o].

Hats

[m] Eſprit des Loix, Liv. 24. Chap. 26.

[n] Eſprit des Loix, Liv. 24. Chap. 23.

[o] Codex, de Feriis, Leg. 3.—Monteſquieu ſays, that this Law muſt have been for the *Pagans*; but it ſeems to me to have been for Chriſtians. The day indeed is called Dies *Solis*, and in other Laws Dies *Dominicus*, yet either name might denote Chriſtian Sunday.—The whole twelfth title ſeems addreſſed, as one body of Law, to Verinus, and ſeveral of its laws relate to *Eaſter*, Chriſtmas, Epiphany, &c. and are therefore undoubtedly for Chriſtians.—Pagans might be obliged not to interrupt or diſturb

Hats are off in Engliſh Churches[P], on, in Dutch.

VIII. "So that nothing be ordained *againſt* God's word." The Puritans would not be contented with this; they would have all ordinances *derived from* the word of God:—and ſo would the *Dutch* Confeſſion: the thing is impracticable, as was obſerved under the twentieth Article; ſo they are obliged to allow little things, which overthrow their own notion. In the Dutch confeſſion they diſclaim human ordinances thus; Nos itaque *omnia humana* inventa, omneſque *leges* rejicimus quæ ad Dei cultum ſunt introductæ—ut iis conſcientiæ ullo modo illaqueentur, aut obſtringantur;—And then they give the thing up by ſaying, that their Preſbyters muſt maintain and appoint *order*, and preſerve ſociety: indeed they add, that even their Preſbyters muſt not deviate from what Chriſt once appointed; yet they admit of *Laws* when wanted for concord, or for retaining them in obedience to God. Who aims at more?—The Confeſſion of *Straſburg*, and ſome others, like our Article, allow any traditions which are *not repugnant* to the Word of God.

IX. But though there *may* be an authority competent to changing Traditions, yet the next thing laid down is, that a *private* individual hath *not* that authority. There is an authority, which may repeal a *civil law*, but yet the Law muſt be obeyed by a private ſubject.

"Whoſoever through his *private* judgment, willingly and privately," &c. A man may violate human ordinances *involuntarily*, or inadvertently, or

diſturb Chriſtians. The Dies *Solis* is, in this Law, called *venerabilis*.

P Popiſh ceremonies would not ſuit our Preſbyterians, were it for nothing elſe but difference of *manners*.

or through ſome urgent buſineſs, as when watering[q] cattle on a Sunday; or through a deſire of not loſing an opportunity of doing[r] good; in ſuch caſes, our Article ſeems to excuſe him.—Another thing ſeems required in order to make him liable to the cenſure afterwards mentioned, that he break traditions *openly*. If he be induced to make free with human religious obſervances, there is a difference between tranſgreſſing diſcreetly, privately, with apologies to thoſe who happen to know of his irregularity; and tranſgreſſing in a public, ſhameleſs manner, as if he gloried in it. The latter does much more harm than the former.

X. "Which be not repugnant to God's word;" —who is to *judge* whether an human ordinance be, or not, repugnant to Scripture?—it ſeems as if the man who breaks the ordinance was here underſtood to judge; and as if it would be taken as a ſufficient excuſe if he declared, he could not obey ſuch an ordinance without diſobeying Scripture.—Indeed it ſeldom happens, that this excuſe[s] is made; though it has been objected to human ordinances, that they were not *taken from* Scripture. —The only puniſhment however, mentioned in the Article, is *Rebuke*.—One confeſſion rejects *Celibacy*[t], as *repugnant* to God's word.

XI. "Ordained and approved"—it is not of the nature of a tradition, according to its etymology, to be *ordained*, but yet that name extends to all human ordinances for the exerciſing of religious principles.—*Approved* ſeems more ſuitable.

"By common authority" – common in Latin is *publicâ*. Authority over *all* thoſe, who are called upon

[q] Luke xiii. 15. [r] John ix. 14.

[s] Neal, A. D. 1566. Chap. 5.—Powell, page 30.—John Burges's Anſwer rejoined, Pref. page 3, 4.

[t] Shorter Confeſſion of Augſburg.

upon to comply:—not confined to a family, or ſmall diſtrict, but extending to the whole *community*.

XII. "Ought to be *rebuked* openly," &c.—is quotation, or nearly ſo, from 1 Tim. v. 20. the Greek word is ελεγχω, and the Latin, *arguo*.—Openly, *coram omnibus*.

XIII. *Three grounds* are mentioned, on which it is wrong for a private man to violate even the human ordinances of religion.

XIV. He "offendeth againſt the common *order* of the Church." Every degree of diſorder muſt check the formation and growth of religious ſentiments; and muſt be hurtful to religious ſociety. Order may particularly refer to religious *aſſemblies*: in them, every irregularity fruſtrates inſtruction, and checks devotion. Uniformity[a] of *ceremonies* was mentioned in the third Book, as well as the nature of religious[x] *ſympathy*.

XV. "Hurteth the authority of the *Magiſtrate*[y]." The authority of a magiſtrate is not only maintained by fear of particular puniſhments, but by a general ſenſe of duty, which never queſtions the foundations of Magiſtracy, but takes it as a thing eſtabliſhed: indeed the dread of puniſhment is alſo in the mind of obedient ſubjects, general, ſettled, and habitual:—Now, whatever unſettles men's habitual regard to the Magiſtrate's authority, gives an opening to refractorineſs in people, who never before had any idea of reſiſting. And that evil the conduct of him produces, who openly violates what the magiſtrate has ordained, or undertaken to enforce.

XVI. "And

[a] Book III. Chap. IV. Sect. II. [x] Book III. Chap. III.

[y] Civil or eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrate? the argument holds as to either: the member of the Church is under obligation both to his eccleſiaſtical and his temporal Governors, to comply with human ordinances.

XVI. "And woundeth the conſciences of the *weak brethren*[z]."—By weak brethren are meant, thoſe Chriſtians, who judge by general *rules*, and *prejudices*, without being able to ſee the foundation of ſuch rules. It often happens, that a rule may be a very good one for common occaſions, and yet breaking through it, in ſome particular circumſtances, may be no way wrong. If the weak brother cannot diſtinguiſh ſuch circumſtances, breaking the rule innocently, may do as much harm to his morals, as breaking it in a manner really wrong. And he who breaks a Tradition, may do nothing which has in it a moral turpitude, and yet his *example* may do as much harm as if he did. Suppoſe a man was perſuaded, (which I am *not*) that travelling on a Sunday, and having cards or muſic in the evening, were not wicked in themſelves; yet he might abſtain from them for fear of corrupting *Servants*.

St. Paul ſpeaks of this mode of corrupting, with the greateſt earneſtneſs. As may be ſeen in the following paſſages; from which it will appear, that the expreſſion *wounding* is ſcriptural.—Rom. xiv. 13. 15. 20. 21.—1 Cor. viii. 9—13.—1 Cor. ix. 19, &c.—Gal. v. 13.

XVII. This part about private men breaking Traditions, was aimed at the *Puritans*[a], I fancy, or ſome brethren of their way of thinking; as the Dutch were. There was a perſon called *Flacius Illyricus*, who ſeems to have been very uncomplying: Melancthon held a controverſy with him. —Indeed the German conteſt about *Adiaphoriſts* was

[z] There are a great many expreſſions in the Confeſſions of the reformed, about *Scandal*, or giving *Offence*.

[a] John a Laſco, the ſuperintendant of the foreign Proteſtants in London, a Poliſh Nobleman, ſeems to have been a Puritan, in 1550.

was extended to merits, juſtification, &c.—but with regard to Traditions, Flacius Illyricus ſeems to have ſaid, that it was better to give up any preferments[b] than to comply.—We have before had an account of Biſhop *Hooper's* diſtreſſes about Habits; and have obſerved, that the Puritans excluded the civil Magiſtrate from all authority in ſpiritual matters: how was anything to be *enforced?* It was a pity they could not have formed a *ſeparate* body peaceably; but of that enough under the laſt Article.

It may ſeem ſtrange, that the Engliſh did not contrive this, while they were ſeparating from the Church of Rome themſelves; but, I ſuppoſe, they never thought of ſuch a thing.—They had advanced ſo far as to think, that the Pope had no right to domineer over all nations; that any *Nation* might withdraw itſelf from his religious confederation; but that a ſet of Chriſtians *in* a Nation, could rightly and regularly, withdraw itſelf from the National Church, might never enter into their minds.—In the Saxon Heptarchy there might be ſeven different Churches. And Biſhop Burnet thought, that the different cuſtoms in our own Church, meaning thoſe of Sarum, Lincoln, Bangor, Hereford, all reduced to one by the Acts of Uniformity, might have had their riſe under the Saxon Government.

XVIII. The *Familiſts* complied with all ceremonies, and cared for none; as Rogers, on this Article, tells us from their Founder Henry Nicholas.

XIX. The

[b] Melancthon, Epiſt. Theol. page 455. quoted by Rogers, page 202.—Rogers alſo refers to Melancthon ad Paſtores in Comitatu Mansfield, for a proof of melancholy effects from non-compliance.—And ſee Neal, Vol. 1. quarto, page 97.—And John Burges's Anſwer rejoined, Preface, page 2.—And Moſheim, by Index.

XIX. The laſt paragraph is additional: perhaps it might be thought uſeful, in order to ſtate preciſely what is the authority by which Traditions may be changed.—The firſt paragraph ſaid they *may* be changed, but not by whom; the ſecond (as I ſhould underſtand it) that an *individual* cannot change them; then the third ſteps in, and ſays, that a *particular church* can: that is, for itſelf. This was a more explicit account than the former, of departing from the Church of *Rome*.

Before Toleration was allowed, there could not well be a particular church which was not a *national* Church, but now, I ſhould think, there might.

"*Man's Authority*,"—means the authority of Councils, Emperors, Fathers; Decretals of Popes, Injunctions of Princes and Prelates.

"Edifying" is taken from Rom. xiv. 19.—This is a duty of imperfect obligation; as in Art. XXXII. Sect. XIV.

XX. It belongs to the Hiſtory and explanation of the laſt paragraph, to mention ſome of the *reaſons* aſſigned for changing the Romiſh Traditions. Thoſe reaſons will ſhew us the *faults* into which men may run in fixing upon religious ordinances.—The Romiſh Traditions then, we are[c] told, were too *numerous*, ſo as to over-burthen the mind; ſo *intricate* as to perplex, and ſo nice, that the fear of not performing them all rightly, as not doing ſo was eſteemed mortal ſin, has driven ſome to deſpair, and even[d] to *ſuicide*. They are not ſuited

[c] Confeſſions in the Syntagma.

[d] This is cited, in the Augſburg Confeſſion, from *Gerſon*, a Romaniſt, who was at the Council of Conſtance. (Of a village in the Dioceſe of Reims called *Gerſon*; his name was really Jean *Charlier*: he died 1429, aged 66.)

ſuited to the ſimplicity of the Chriſtian religion, which aboliſhed a great number of ceremonies, without ſubſtituting others in their room. They have made men preſume on their merits, and ſo have ſuperſeded the moſt important *principles* of the Chriſtian life; as the ſtudy of them has ſuperſeded the ſtudy of the Scriptures.—They were ſuperſtitious, childiſh[e], ridiculous, unworthy of a ſober man. Suppoſing each indifferent in itſelf, they became ſinful by expreſſing wrong ſentiments; as in the caſe mentioned 1 Cor. x. 27, 28.

XXI. Hence thoſe traditions may be looked upon as *good*, which are few, ſimple, pleaſing; which exerciſe without fatiguing, which call into action the beſt principles of human nature, apply them to Religion, and are ſubſervient to them: which pretend to no merit, and require little or no ſtudy; which are grave, rational, inſtructive, becoming; and clear from all ſuperſtition and fanaticiſm[f].

XXII. We have now finiſhed Hiſtory and Explanation: ſomething muſt be ſaid in the way of *Proof*.

Three things might be propoſed for proof.

1. Traditions need not be, in all places preciſely the ſame.

2. Each *individual* ought to *conform* to thoſe ſettled by that authority to which he is ſubject.

3. Each

[e] Third part of Homily on good Works.—Biſhop Jewel in Syntagma.—King Edward's Injunctions: Sparrow, page 9.

[f] Here, or at the end of this Article, might be read the *Preface* to our Book of Common Prayer; a compoſition which has been deſervedly recommended.—In this place I read at Lecture a paſſage, which ſeemed intereſting, from a collection of Eſſays called *Juvenile excurſions*, by the Rev. Mr. *Tindal*, page 121—123. This Gentleman is Author of the Antiquities of *Eveſham*, and of ſeveral muſical compoſitions in the higheſt ſtile of Genius and expreſſion.

3. Each particular or National *Church*, hath authority to ordain its own rites.

XXXIII. For the firſt, a reaſon is given in the Article, drawn from the experience[g] of all ages.—The Confeſſion of Augſburg cites Matt. xv. 3. 9. 11. —Rom. xiv. 17.—Col. ii. 16, &c.—1 Tim. iv. 1. —Might not 1 Cor. viii. 8. be added?

XXIV. That an *individual* ought to conform, is proved from the reaſon of the thing, and from Scripture; but to avoid miſtakes, it ſhould be again obſerved, that no ſet of Chriſtians is underſtood to belong to that Church, though ſubſiſting in their own Country, which they would quit, if they had a full and free Toleration.

Confining ourſelves to thoſe who are real, willing members of the Church, we need only aſk, on a foot of *reaſon*, can any end be obligatory, and not the means neceſſary for attaining that end? If every one ſays, he will uſe his *own* means of promoting Religion, that, from the nature of ſocial religion, is the ſame thing as determining to uſe no means at all. All (who aſſociate) muſt uſe the ſame means, or the end cannot be anſwered; and there is no way for men to uſe the ſame means, but ſubmitting to authority.—Suppoſe a ſecretary is told to write a letter, (if I may again uſe the illuſtration), he omits to write it; he is blamed; would it not be thought very childiſh if he ſaid in his excuſe, that he never was ordered to take pen, ink and paper? all that he neglected was what he had never been *ordered* to do?

If *ſcriptural* proof be wanted, in a caſe where ſcripture might be ſuppoſed to be ſilent, we may alledge the conduct of St. Paul as recorded in Acts xxi. 20, 21. 24. 26. and in Acts xxviii. 17. on

[g] Sect. IV.

on which may be read Dr. Wotton's[h] remark.—The firſt ſixteen verſes of 1 Cor. xi. relate to things of inferior moment, which had been taught *verbally*.—The ſecond verſe contains praiſe for keeping παραδοσεις, tranſlated in the text *ordinances*, in the margin, *traditions*. The ſixteenth verſe founds the obſervance of them on *cuſtom*; and the laſt verſe of the ſame Chapter ſhews, that St. Paul intended to give more verbal directions; ſuch, ſeemingly, as he did not think it worth while to deliver in writing.

1 Cor. xiv. 40. ſhews, that it is a ſcriptural duty to provide means for anſwering any end propoſed.

2 Theſſ. ii. 15. and iii. 6. are about παραδοσεις, which might relate to either doctrine or practice.

XXV. Each particular or national church hath authority to ordain its own rites.—This was, in effect, proved of every religious Society before[i]. With regard to a *national* Church, as diſtinguiſhed from any other particular church, we might obſerve, that either it can ſettle and unſettle its own rites, or ſome external power can oblige it to attend *Councils*; the contrary to which was ſhewn under the twenty-firſt Article.

XXVI. As to *indirect* proof, I do not recollect any *objection* but one, which ſeems of any weight; that is, Can a church oblige its members to obſerve all ordinances whatſoever?—and this was anſwered under the twentieth Article.

XXVII. Neither do I ſee that I need detain you by an *Application*. A form of aſſent is not wanted.—Mutual conceſſions were conſidered under the twentieth

[h] Miſna, Preface, page xlvi. See alſo Lardner's Works, Vol. 11. page 346—353.—In this Diſſertation of Lardner's there is a good account of St. Paul's Compliances.

[i] Art. xx. Sect. iv.

twentieth Article. And improvements at the end of the third Book [k].

[k] The ſubject of eating *Blood* might come under this Article. —I did not enter into it farther than by giving the contents of Lardner's Diſſertation on Acts xv. and of his remarks on Acts xxi. 20—26. adding anything that occurred to my own mind. A compariſon of theſe two paſſages of Scripture would be very uſeful to any Governors of Chriſtian Societies, who were at a loſs for rules of conduct when they were deſirous of ſuiting men's *prejudices* The Editor of Lardner's Works has given an Index of Texts explained, by which the two paſſages may be eaſily found.

ARTICLE XXXV.

OF THE HOMILIES.

THE ſecond Book of Homilies, the ſeveral titles whereof we have joined under this Article, doth contain a godly and wholſome Doctrine, and neceſſary for theſe times, as doth the former Book of Homilies, which were ſet forth in the time of Edward the Sixth; and therefore we judge them to be read in Churches by the Miniſters, diligently and diſtinctly, that they may be underſtanded of the people.

Of the Names of the Homilies.

1. Of the right Uſe of the Church.
2. Againſt peril of Idolatry.
3. Of repairing and keeping clean of Churches.
4. Of good Works; firſt of Faſting.
5. Againſt Gluttony and Drunkenneſs.
6. Againſt Exceſs of Apparel.
7. Of Prayer.
8. Of the Place and Time of Prayer.
9. That Common Prayer and Sacraments ought to be miniſtered in a known Tongue.
10. Of the reverend eſtimation of God's Word.
11. Of Alms-doing.
12. Of the Nativity of Chriſt.
13. Of the Paſſion of Chriſt.
14. Of the Reſurrection of Chriſt.
15. Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Chriſt.
16. Of the Gifts of the Holy Ghoſt.
17. For the Rogation-days.
18. Of the ſtate of Matrimony.
19. Of Repentance.
20. Againſt Idleneſs.
21. Againſt Rebellion.

1. Here

1. Here again we begin with *Hiſtory*.

The ancient Greek Fathers, Chryſoſtom, Baſil, &c. uſed to preach plain diſcourſes to the people; and the proper name for ſuch a diſcourſe was Ὁμιλια. *Sermo* anſwers to it in Latin. Neither word implies anything refined or elaborate: but each rather denotes familiar, and popular diſcourſe. And ſuch all *ſermons* ad Populum ſhould be.

In later times, the word *Homily* ſignifies a popular diſcourſe, or Sermon, regularly compoſed; but it includes the additional idea, of being publicly read, and profeſſedly, by one who was not the Author. Thoſe of which we uſually ſpeak, are ſuppoſed to have been publiſhed by *authority*.

Sparrow, in his Rationale, page 223, ſays, that by a Council at *Vaiſon* (Conc. Vaſ.) in France, in caſe of the Prieſt's ſickneſs, &c. the *Deacon* was ordered to read the Homilies of the Holy Fathers. —I ſee, by Cave, that one Conc. Vaſ. was in 442, another in 529.—I ſhould imagine the latter to be meant by Sparrow.

We are told, that in the ninth Century, ſo large a number of what we ſhould now call Homilies as 209, were compoſed by our Countryman *Alcuin*, Preceptor to Charlemagne, and uſed as ours were intended to be[a].—That Great Emperor ſeems to have known how to improve mankind.—I feel regret that they are loſt; probably they would be plain, ſhort, inſtructive.

But though in the ninth Century Preachers might want helps, yet at the time of the *Reformation*, the need of them was inconceivably great.—The country Prieſts were extremely ignorant, if they had deſired to inſtruct the people; but they were, a great many of them, given up to idleneſs and

[a] Wheatly, page 283. from Sixtus Sinenſis.—Prieſtley, Hiſt. Corr. Vol. 2. page 125.

and worldly pleaſures. And from thoſe who did employ themſelves at all in inſtruction, little good was to be expected, either to individuals, or the community.—The Papiſt taught in one extreme, the Puritans in another; and the proper Engliſh reformed Miniſters, in a mean between the two; but a mean, though the moſt reaſonable, is leaſt likely to ſtrike men, or to ſucceed.—Nor were teachers only of theſe three ſorts; all mens minds were afloat, all running wild, being ſet free after a long and ſlaviſh confinement; one might ſay, there were almoſt as many ſects as teachers What effects muſt this have on the minds of the people! how deſtructive muſt it be of every good *principle!*—Dr. Balguy obſerves, "That the ſupport of oppoſite religions tends to the deſtruction of *all* religion[b]." It happened moreover unfortunately, that the Puritans were more able as well as more diligent than thoſe Teachers, who were moſt ſupported by authority; ſo that thoſe of the Engliſh Church, who wiſhed to do *their beſt*, were not able to contend with their adverſaries; nor were they able, generally ſpeaking, to give a ſatisfactory account of the doctrine of *Juſtification*, on which the Reformation turned; or to anſwer the long-eſtabliſhed arguments of the *Romaniſts* in in favour of their Sacraments, celibacy, &c.—In ſhort, all was either neglect of religion, or confuſion about it.—No wonder that preaching was frequently *forbidden*.—It was forbidden by Henry VIII. by Edward VI. by Queen Mary; and by Queen Elizabeth; nay, in the latter end of the reign of Elizabeth there were[c] ſtill very few preachers.

[b] Dr. Balguy, Charge v. page 256. and before and after this paſſage.

[c] In 1578. See Neal, Vol. 1. page 114. 116.—See alſo Neal, 1. 245. and John Burges, Pref. page 3.

preachers. Neal ſpeaks of eight thouſand pariſhes which had no preaching[d] Miniſters.—And in Biſhop Sparrow's collection we may find many authentic expreſſions[e] to confirm the account now given.

There was, in the time of Henry VIII. an intention[f] of publiſhing a collection of Homilies, but it was never executed.—Our firſt Book, which is mentioned in our Article, though the *titles* are not there given, was prepared in the firſt year of King Edward VI. in 1547, and copies of it were diſtributed throughout the Nation.—It is ſaid to have been compoſed, for the moſt part, by Archbiſhop Cranmer, though ſome think that thoſe eminent men who had aſſiſted in reforming the Liturgy, were joined with him in compiling the Homilies; Ridley, Thirlby, &c. and Heylin fancies, he perceives in thoſe compoſitions, the popular ſtile of Latimer.—The method of diſtributing them was by a *Royal viſitation*:—a ſolemn affair! ſuperſeding all other viſitations, not only of Archdeacons, &c. but of Biſhops and Archbiſhops. Not that the King went into any diſtrict in perſon; he was very young; but every thing was tranſacted in his name. The nation was divided into *ſix circuits*, and a committee of five was appointed to viſit each; conſiſting of two Gentlemen, and one Civilian; with a Divine, or Chaplain, and Regiſtrary: a copy of the firſt Book of the Homilies was left, in this viſitation, for every pariſh Prieſt.

Our *ſecond Book* of Homilies, the titles of which are mentioned in our Article, was publiſhed early in

[d] Neal, 1. page 320.

[e] Sparrow's Collection, page 11. 75, 76. 123. 127.—See alſo Heylin's Laud, page 8. and Rutherforth's Charges, page 1.

[f] Strype's Cranmer, page 148. For the other things here mentioned, ſee page 146.—Neal, 1. page 31, 32. and Heylin's Hiſt. Quinqu. page 550.

in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; in 1560.—They had been prepared, or nearly ſo, before the death of King Edward; and they ſeem to be, in a manner, promiſed in his Injunctions.—They were compoſed, in a good meaſure, by Biſhop Jewel, author of the famous Apology for the Reformation[g].

Fox ſpeaks of ſome Homilies in Queen Mary's time.

After this, the Puritans were ſo diligent and powerful in preaching, and at the ſame time ſo regular and decent in their manners, that ſome of their adverſaries, in the Church of England, wiſhed for more Homilies and leſs preaching: more homilies for the Churchmen, leſs preaching from the Puritans. This was the caſe of Archbiſhop Bancroft[h] at the Hampton Court Conference in 1603, and afterwards of Heylin[i]. This looks as if the Homilies had incidentally contributed towards a *remiſſneſs* about improvements in preaching: however, the number is very ſmall for one to be read every Sunday and Holiday.—Alcuin's 209 would have been a properer number.

The number of Sermons preſcribed by Law, was ſmall, in the time of Elizabeth: and preaching Miniſters were diſtinguiſhed from others, becauſe none could preach without a licence from his Biſhop.—But James I. made a Canon ordering a Sermon to be preached *every Sunday*[k]; the Puritans,

[g] See Sparrow's Collection, page 11.—Neal, Vol. 1. page 108.—Compare Burnet on the Articles, Preface, page xii. octavo, with expoſition of this Article, near the beginning.—Wheatly on the Common Prayer, page 283, ſays, the ſecond Book of Homilies was publiſhed in 1563, the year of the Convocation.

[h] Neal, 1. 416. [i] Heylin's Life of Laud, page 9.

[k] Canon 45, that is, by a *licenced* preacher.—If any one was not licenced, he could only, by Canon 49, read an Homily.

Puritans, always attentive to their buſineſs, contrived to get *Sunday afternoons* to addreſs the people in: they would not call their diſcourſes, *Sermons*; they were *Lectures:* and that was the origin of *Lectures*; theſe Lectures would of courſe be in a degree hoſtile to the Church at firſt; now they are not ſo in the leaſt.—Puritans pleaded againſt[l] anything but Scripture being *read* in Church; they were always enemies to the Apocrypha.

Dr. *John Burges* has been mentioned[m] *before*:—he refuſed to ſubſcribe the Articles, except his interpretation of ſome paſſages, might be accepted by thoſe in authority. Not being at firſt attended to, he was *deprived*, in courſe. But afterwards, James I. Archbiſhop Abbot, and his Dioceſan accepted his ſenſe as the *right* ſenſe, and he was reſtored.—One Article on which he offered his interpretation, was this thirty-fifth. His Book, in which this appears, was publiſhed by command of Charles I[n].

Dr. Balguy[o] ſays, "it ſeems, we are allowed, not required, to read the homilies of the church, inſtead of our own private compoſitions: eſpecially as thoſe homilies are recommended to us with a particular reference to the *times* in which they were written." Yet in many laws, &c. miniſters are[p] *ordered* to read the Homilies unleſs they be licenced to preach.—And the *Rubric* which ſays, "then ſhall follow the Sermon *or* one of the Homilies," &c. muſt mean a Sermon by a perſon authorized to preach: a ſermon, if the officiating Miniſter be

[l] Rogers on the Article.

[m] Book III. Chap. VII. Sect. IV.—Book IV. Introd. Sect. VI. and in other places.

[n] X—4—10, Sid. Coll. entitled, *An anſwer rejoined*, &c. page 23—26:—The Dedication is to Charles I.

[o] Dr. Balguy, Diſcourſe 7. page 118.

[p] See Burn's Eccleſiaſtical Law, under *Public Worſhip*.

be a licenſed preacher, and chuſe to preach a ſermon; otherwiſe an Homily. Nevertheleſs, Dr. Balguy's opinion appears to me to be juſt: for it is now the general *practice* to preach; and not checking practice, is ratifying it. Then the form of ordaining a Prieſt is, "take thou authority to *preach* the word of God." And old Canons before the Reformation[q], enjoin preaching.—For a while there was a neceſſity for putting a ſtop to preaching without licence; that neceſſity is acknowledged, in our Article, to be the ground of publiſhing the Homilies; but in all caſes of neceſſity, when the difficulty which preſſes is over, things return into their former regular channel; therefore, in this caſe, when preaching is no longer dangerous, the obligation to uſe the Homilies ceaſes.

I conclude this Hiſtory with mentioning, that *Dupin*[r] ſuſpends his judgment in regard to this Article, having never read the Homilies which are the ſubject of it.—Some things in them might poſſibly occaſion difficulties.

II. Our next buſineſs is *Explanation*.

Godly;—ſometimes ευσεβης means *pious*, as oppoſed to *virtuous*[s]; and ſo, I think, it does here; though ſometimes it means *good*, in a popular ſenſe, without diſtinction of Religion and Virtue; as when it is oppoſed to αδικος[t]—All religious doctrines are not worthy of this epithet. The doctrine of the Maſs has been called *blaſphemous*.

"*Wholſome*" doctrine, we had in Art. XI. ſalutary, uſeful;—"full of mercy and good fruits," according to[u] St. James's expreſſion; or what we ſhould

[q] Burn, ibidem; and Sparrow's Rationale, 12mo. page 219.
[r] Third Appendix to Moſheim.
[s] Tit. ii. 12. [t] 2 Pet. ii. 9.
[u] James iii. 17.

ſhould more commonly call, of a good *moral* tendency: *godly* relates to Religion, and *wholſome*, to Virtue.

"*Doctrine*"—the Latin word *Doctrina* conveys a more juſt idea than the Engliſh word Doctrine. The meaning ſeems to be, teaching, inſtruction.

Doctrine is ſometimes* oppoſed to *arguments*, illuſtrations; figures of ſpeech, &c.

Saying that the Homilies convey pious and moral inſtruction, or "good and wholſome doctrine," ſeems to me to be oppoſed to any high pretenſions; ſeems to ſay, they may not be *perfect*, they may not be above *criticiſm*, but they are good and *uſeful*.—And who that has read them attentively, unprejudiced by the language being ſomewhat antiquated, is ſo perverſe as not to allow this? who indeed does not allow it of any Sermon he hears, if the fundamentals of it are not to him, heretical? That cannot be the caſe while we conceive ourſelves members of the Church of England; becauſe the principles of the Homilies muſt be the ſame with thoſe of the Articles.—Take the words literally, and it is enough if piety and virtue are inculcated in two pages, though all the reſt be worthleſs and inſipid; or even fooliſh.—But in all interpretation, we ſhould aim at finding out the *true intent and meaning* of the Author: and any perſon means to ſpeak, or expreſs himſelf, on any ſubject, as it is *uſually* ſpoken of.

Suppoſe then you had been hearing a Sermon, might not you ſay of it, naturally, 'Our Preacher gave us a very *good Sermon* to day, in a ſpirit of true *piety* and *virtue*; I hope his hearers will reflect upon it.—That reconciliation of St. Paul and St. James, though a ſenſible one, was not the very beſt in my judgment; but the Sermon was a very *good*

* Bennet's Directions; on the Article.

good and *uſeful* Sermon?'—Such ſeems to be the meaning of the account which our Article gives of our Homilies. It cannot poſſibly mean that they are totally *perfect*, unexceptionable, ſuch as can never be *improved* upon by the human underſtanding. Indeed the character given of them ſhews great moderation; eſpecially conſidering how very good they muſt appear when new.

"And *neceſſary* for *theſe times*;"—that is, for the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign: as the Epiſtle to the Galatians was for the times in which it was written:—but *neceſſary* ſeems oppoſed to godly and wholſome:—the diſcourſes are godly and wholſome in themſelves, without conſidering any particular ſtate of things, but for theſe times, they are *neceſſary:* for times when all would be confuſion and diſorder without them; when that *unity of doctrine*, which is neceſſary to the very being of religious ſociety, is unattainable in the common method of preaching.—I would farther obſerve, on the word *neceſſary*, that it ſeems to imply what we ordinarily call a *caſe of neceſſity:* the nature of which is, to occaſion certain meaſures for a time, and to have them left off when the neceſſity ceaſes[y].

"And

[y] I never was more ſurpriſed by a piece of criticiſm than by one in the *Monthly Review* for September 1790, page 110, perſiſted in, page 360, of the ſame Vol. in ſpite of the remonſtrance of E. P.—In which, the words, "*theſe times*," are ſuppoſed to be underſtood by each ſubſcriber, of his *own* times.—The Critic ridicules the notion of any one's underſtanding them of the times of the Reformation; and argues, by way of reductio ad abſurdum, that, if ſuch were the caſe, any one who ſubſcribed the Article, muſt underſtand *Hiſtory*; nay, he might go on to *other* articles, and take *them* as declarations to be conſtrued by ſome ſort of reference to the *times* in which they were made.—How much *Hiſtory* any one muſt underſtand for our *preſent* Art. has already appeared; with regard to *others*, I have endeavoured

"And therefore *we* judge them," &c.—who is meant by the word *we?* Queen Elizabeth, I apprehend? not the Subſcriber. The words ſeem part of an injunction; I do no remember any thing like them in the Articles; except "we decree" in Article XXXVI.

"By the Miniſters,"—ſeems to confirm this notion; it would be an odd thing for a Candidate for Deacon's Orders to ſay, I think it proper, that ſuch a particular ſet of Diſcourſes ſhould be read by "*the Miniſters.*"

"Miniſters," are diſtinguiſhed from *licenſed preachers.*

"To be read,"—theſe words want no explanation; but yet they ſuggeſt the difference between preaching and reading. When a man *reads* anything he does not anſwer for its being *true:* a man may read what is ever ſo falſe, without the leaſt impeachment of his veracity. In a Court of Juſtice, if a Cryer reads a *depoſition*, he has no concern with the truth of it. The honeſt Chaplain of Sir Roger[z] de Coverly, read to the Family a Sermon, firſt of one author, and then of another; he gave their illuſtrations and arguments fairly; they might differ from each other; that was no concern of his. If the *Statute Law* of the Land requires me to read ſeveral pages of a book in a certain

voured in the third Book (Chap. IX.) to ſhew how far Hiſtory is uſeful for aſcertaining their ſenſe: and on every Article I have thought it well worth while to make ſome hiſtorical obſervations.—I believe the ſenſe of "*thoſe times,*" given by the Reviewers, is quite *new.* All other accounts which I have ever ſeen, make the expreſſion relate to the times of the *Reformation.*—(Book III. Chap. IX. Sect. VI.)

There is an appearance, in the above Criticiſm, of *deſpiſing* the ſubject, ſo as not even to *wiſh* to ſeem to be reaſonable upon it.

[z] Spectator, No. 106.

certain aſſembly, it muſt be very bad indeed, or very erroneous, idolatrous, &c. before I ſhould think myſelf obliged in honour and conſcience to reſiſt: in ſuch a caſe might not the reader be allowed to ſuſpect his *own* judgment?

Heylin wiſhes there had "been more reading of *Homilies*, in which the reader ſpeaks the ſenſe of the Church; and not ſo much of *ſermonizing*, in which the Preacher many times ſpeaks his own factious and erroneous[a] ſenſe."—I have ſometimes thought, that even a Preacher ought to preach the ſenſe of the Church, and not his own ſenſe; as I had once an occaſion of mentioning before[b].

Is then Biſhop Burnet's obſervation juſt, that one ſhould believe the Romaniſts to be *Idolaters*, before one ſigns this Article? The *Reader* need not form a judgment; he reads to the Congregation the paſſages which are quoted in the Homily, from Romiſh writers; and the arguments which are there uſed; let every man judge for himſelf.

The *titles* of the Homilies *vary*, in different places where they occur, more than might be wiſhed: of the Homily of Juſtification we ſpoke under the eleventh Article[c]. That called the tenth Homily in our preſent thirty-fifth Article, is entitled thus, "10. Of the reverent eſtimation of God's Word;" but in the Book of Homilies it is entitled, "An information for them which take offence at certain places of Scripture;" and one ſhould be aware of the ſame irregularity in other inſtances.—Sometimes a title is more full in one enumeration, ſometimes in the other.

III. We

[a] Heylin's Laud, page 9.

[b] Book III. Chap. v. Sect. v.—I am glad to ſee a Confirmation of this idea from authority: See Sparrow's Rationale, page 219, duodecimo.

[c] Art. XI. Sect. XXI.

III. We ſhould now proceed to *Proof*; but it ſeems to me, that our Explanation has rendered proof unneceſſary: at leaſt direct proof: perhaps it may be thought, that we ought to mention ſome *objections* to the Homilies.

IV. 1. It has been ſaid, then, that when our Homilies repreſent[d] different *Patriarchs* as deſirous to have the Meſſiah for a deſcendant, they err; becauſe it was well known, that the Meſſiah was to be of the Tribe of *Judah*. But the Homily is ſpeaking of Abraham and Jacob; who both would entertain ſuch a wiſh before Judah was born.

2. It has been ſaid, that paſſages of the *Apocrypha* are[e] aſcribed to the teaching of the *Holy Ghoſt*. —But the compilers of the ſixth Article would ſcarcely make an Homily to contradict that Article in *ſenſe*:—on examination it appears, that ſome paſſages of the Apocrypha are mixed and incorporated with others from the Book of *Proverbs*; and they, all *together*, are piouſly referred to the Holy Ghoſt. And why may we not refer *any* expreſſion, as well as any action, which we think good, to divine influence?

Such a ſentiment as is expreſſed in our Homily by words taken from the Apocrypha, if it occurred in a work of the Imagination, in poliſhed language, would by ſome be called an *heavenly* ſentiment. Little more ſeems to have been meant, in former times, when ſome mention was made of the Holy Ghoſt: only the view of the ſubject might be always *religious* when ſuch an expreſſion was uſed. For the ordinary manner of referring events to heaven, ſee Art. X. Sect. XXXIX.

Making

[d] Homilies, 8vo. page 290.——The objection is mentioned in Bingham, Vol. 2. page 742, folio.

[e] Page 303, octavo.—on Alms, ſecond Part.

Making ſuch poor objections as theſe does in reality reflect great *praiſe* upon our Homilies.—Some exceptions, I think, have been taken to the Homily on *Rebellion*[f]. The reconciling of St. Paul and St. James has been thought not ſo good as ſome more modern. I have owned that I could not quite come up to ſome expreſſions about good[g] works. But if we even *ſubſcribed* to the Homilies (which we do not) and many more *improvements* had been made ſince they were written, than theſe, or than have been made, I ſhould think myſelf ſafe, on the principles laid down in the third Book[h].

I have hitherto ſpoken, ſince I entered on this Article, as if our Homilies were only *excuſeable*, and deſerved no praiſe; but that was only for the ſake of thoſe who have a leſs favourable idea of them than myſelf.—I have really a very high opinion of them, and I read them with much pleaſure; they ſeem to me to ſhew ſtrong intellects and fine feelings; a very great inſight into the true meaning of ſcripture, and a very nice and accurate knowledge of mankind. They abound with fine ſtrokes of eloquence, and they contain ſome inſtances of the ridiculous, which may be imitations of *Elijah's* ſarcaſms on the Prophets of Baal.

The authors of them have been alſo very converſant in the writings of the Fathers, and in Church-Hiſtory.

To mention one or two in particular; I have already quoted paſſages from the ſecond, third, fourth, and fifth, ſixteenth, twenty-firſt, and the twenty-ſeventh. I have alſo recommended that on *Matrimony*[i]. But I thought we received the moſt important ſervice from thoſe on what may be called,

[f] Bennet, on the Article, (Directions).
[g] Art. XIII. Sect. V. Homily, part 1ſt. on Good Works.
[h] Book III. Chap. VI. and Chap. IX. Sect. X. XI.
[i] Art. XXV.

called, in a large ſenſe, *Juſtification*.—Strype is of opinion[k], that the Homily on *Salvation* was particularly the compoſition of Cranmer himſelf. And Biſhop *Horſley* praiſes the ſet[l] which we now ſpeak of, and recommends them ſtrongly to the peruſal of the Clergy[m] of his Dioceſe.

When we were treating of ſingle life, I had intended to read the concluſion of the eleventh, as ſuggeſting rules for making that ſtate innocent.

If theſe compoſitions contain ſo many things worthy of notice in the preſent times, how valuable muſt they have been in ſuch a dearth of Doctrine as prevailed at the times when they were publiſhed!—I before had occaſion[n] to obſerve, that they throw great light upon our Articles; and therefore I will now only add, that I find them continually improve upon me; the more I read them, the more I find in them to approve and admire.

This opinion, being in reply to objections, is part of our indirect proof.

v. As the "times" are, in this Article, expreſsly taken into conſideration, any *Application*, ariſing from eſtimating the difference of times, ſeems to be unneceſſary.

To enter into a diſcourſe on the nature and benefits of *preaching*, would carry us too far out of our way; yet I may juſt obſerve, that our approbation of the Homilies muſt not be underſtood as if they ſuperſeded the compoſition of Sermons at this time: I ſaid ſomething of this before, in the third Book[o].

[k] Strype's Life of Cranmer, page 149.
[l] See theſe ſpoken of collectively, Art. XI. Sect. XXI.
[m] Charge, 1790, page 36.
[n] Introduction to Book IV. Sect. IV.
[o] Book III. Chap. V. Sect. VI. and Chap. IX. Sect. VI.

ARTICLE XXXVI.

OF THE CONSECRATION OF BISHOPS AND MINISTERS.

THE Book of Conſecration of Archbiſhops and Biſhops, and Ordering of Prieſts and Deacons, lately ſet forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the ſame time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things neceſſary to ſuch Conſecration and Ordering: neither hath it any thing that of itſelf is ſuperſtitious or ungodly. And therefore whoſoever are conſecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, ſince the ſecond year of the forenamed King Edward, unto this time, or hereafter ſhall be conſecrated or ordered according to the ſame Rites; we decree all ſuch to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully conſecrated and ordered.

---

1. The twenty-third Article was about the ſubject of ordaining in general; this is about the *Engliſh* mode in particular. It will be difficult to avoid ſome repetition; but I will endeavour to avoid it as far as may be, without maiming our preſent ſubject.—I begin with *Hiſtory*. And here, as in ſome former Articles, it appears to be our beſt plan to begin with what ſeems to be the general reaſon of the facts before us.

A religious

A religious teacher, commiſſioned immediately by Heaven, has a ſyſtem of religion to publiſh throughout the world. He muſt employ men under him as his inſtruments.—He ſends a ſmall number on the buſineſs, he travels about to ſome places himſelf. He dies. His adherents are not diſmayed; the ſame ſmall number take a leading part: they conceive themſelves encouraged from above: they ſet themſelves upon fixing their new Religion in different towns and cities; they form *ſocieties* at each place, which may ſubſiſt and increaſe, after they have left it.—That is, they leave ſome perſons veſted with *authority*. Theſe muſt be ſteady, ſober-minded perſons, and of mature age and prudence. Sometimes they meet with one man much more fit for their purpoſe than the reſt; to him they give the more authority on that account; ſometimes they find ſeveral perſons, equally qualified, or nearly ſo; they divide authority amongſt them, make them a Council or Senate. Yet, in order to proceed ſmoothly, ſome one muſt *preſide* even in a Council.—And when one man has the chief authority lodged in him, he muſt aſk advice, and conſult with others: no fear of that, where a man has the good of ſociety entirely at heart, and is unbiaſſed by intereſt, or ambition, or other indirect motives. Nor, in ſuch a caſe, is there a neceſſity for defining exactly each man's powers; or forming what is called a *Conſtitution*; each man will know, or be taught, the place he is fit for, and in that he will act. Syſtems of relative powers, or conſtitutions, are only for thoſe, who, without them, would fall into diſſenſion and anarchy.

In different places, ſomething is found to depend upon men's habitual notions and feelings; that is, upon the kind of government to which they have

been accuſtomed, in civil, religious, or domeſtic ſociety.—But thoſe who want to eſtabliſh religious ſocieties, muſt not only have proper perſons to govern, but to perform the *offices* of religion. It ſeems a thing of courſe, that ſome of thoſe offices ſhould be performed by thoſe who *preſide*, or govern; even the moſt diſtinguiſhed offices; but perhaps there may be a want of ſome perſons to give themſelves *wholly* to performing offices of Religion, and therefore to have no part in the cares of government; if ſuch want appear, ſuch officers muſt be appointed.—The things now mentioned are capable of a great variety of combinations, ſo as to produce a great variety of forms of religious ſociety.

Now only uſe the common *names* for the perſons here deſcribed, and we have a general view of our ſubject.—For the one man, and the preſident, put *Biſhop*, or overſeer: for the Council or Senate, put *preſbytery*; and for the Senators, *Elders* or *Preſbyters*; and for the officers of Religion, put Διακονοι, Miniſters, *Deacons*; and it is eaſy to conceive, that a Biſhop may be an Elder, that Elders may act as overſeers; that a Biſhop may be a Διακονος, and that a Διακονος may be an Elder: and yet that a Biſhop may be a ſuperior to Elders, and ſuperior to Διακονοι.—*Aldermen* are Elders: a *Mayor* is an Alderman, and yet ſuperior to Aldermen; Mayor and ſome Aldermen may be Miniſters (Διακονοι) of Juſtice; and a Corporation may have ſome Miniſters of Juſtice which are not Aldermen[a].

II. Let

[a] See Rom. xiii. 4. for Miniſters or Deacons of Juſtice, if I may ſo ſpeak. The word *Miniſters* is the Engliſh for ὑπηρεται, Luke i. 2. and 1 Cor. iv. 1. Therefore I uſe the word Διακονος in *Greek*, becauſe if it is tranſlated either *Miniſter* or *Deacon*, it ſeems to exclude the other. Might it not be always tranſlated *Miniſter*?—For *Alderman*, ſee Skinner's Lexicon Etymologicon.

11. Let us now turn to *Hiſtory*, and as it does not appear to me, that the Scriptures lay down any form of carrying on Religious Society, which is to be followed on ſcriptural authority, in all places, and at all times, I need not reſerve ſcriptural facts for *Proof*, but may make them a part of the *Hiſtory*.—Acts xi. 30. *Elders* are mentioned (I mean *Chriſtian* elders, the Jewiſh were members of the Sanhedrim), but their appointment is only *implied*. Acts. xiv. 23. Elders are ſolemnly appointed, and in every church: the ſort of perſons and the number, no doubt, ſuitable to each place. —Acts xv. and xvi. *Apoſtles and Elders* are mentioned together, and Acts xv. 23. *Apoſtles, Elders and Brethren*; the Apoſtles were moveable, the elders and brethren, or commonalty, fixed; the Elders governing the Brethren (or commonalty) in the abſence of the Apoſtles.—Acts xx. 17. St. Paul at Miletus ſends for the Elders of Epheſus to come to him.—1 Tim. v. 17. Elders who *rule* well are to have honour.—1 Tim. iv. 14. compared with 2 Tim. i. 6. ſeems to ſhew, that the Elders joined in the ceremony of ordination; even of Timothy himſelf: in 1 Tim. v. 22. Timothy is mentioned *alone*, as ordaining, but as it is in the way of exhortation or *advice* to Timothy, the Elders might not be mentioned though they did join.—Acts vi. 6. all the Apoſtles lay on hands.—Tit. i. 5. *Titus* is to ordain (καθιστημι) Elders in every city:—an *hundred* cities in *Crete*[b] and no Biſhop but himſelf.—James v. 14. ſpeaks of Elders as cuſtomary.—1 Pet. v. 1. Peter calls himſelf a συμπρεσβυτερος, a fellow-preſbyter, or Elder; and in the next verſe, ſpeaks of Elders as επισκοπουντες, overlooking, and feeding the flock of Chriſt, the Αρχιποιμην.—St. John calls himſelf, at the opening of

[b] Powell's Theſis, page 366.

of his ſecond and third Epiſtles, Ὁ πρεσβυτερος, "*the* Elder." No Epiſtle is addreſſed to the Elders. That to the Philippians is addreſſed to the Chriſtians at large, with the Επισκοποις and Διακονοις: if there were "*elders* in *every city*," there muſt be at Philippi: they might be included in the word επισκοποις, as επισκοπουντες: why elſe, for ſuch a Church as Philippi, is Επισκοποι in the plural number[c]?

The name of Επισκοπος has been thought to come from the LXX, If. lx. 17. It ſignifies *Overſeer*. In the Engliſh Bible the word Biſhop occurs but three times, beſides Phil. i. 1. already mentioned, and 1 Pet. ii. 25. which laſt is figurative: the words are, "the ſhepherd and biſhop of your ſouls." The idea of *Shepherd* is more common than that of *Overſeer:* but they are joined Acts xx. 28. as well as here: the Greek word in Acts xx. 28. for *Overſeer*, is Επισκοπος.—*Timothy* may not be *called* a Biſhop, but he confers honours on the Elders, proportioned to their deſerts. He receives accuſations againſt them: and Titus ordains them: theſe are acts of a *Superior*. At firſt, Apoſtles directed Elders.—Acts xx. 17. Paul, as before, ſends for the Elders from Epheſus to Miletus.—Peter exhorts Elders. And the expreſſion, "Apoſtles and Elders," occurs ſeveral times. Whatever is ſuperior to Preſbyters, we ſhould call a Biſhop[d].

The

[c] Lardner mentions a notion, not as his own, that there might be, early in the ſecond Century, *two* Biſhops of Antioch at one time, one over *Jewiſh*, the other over *Gentile* Chriſtians. Works, Vol. 2. page 66. there might, at any time, be ſome Επισκοποι ſuperior to the *ordinary Elders*.

[d] For the ground of the obſervations here made, ſee Acts xv. 22.—1 Tim. v. 1. 17. 19.—Titus i. 5.—1 Pet. v. 1 —1 Tim. v. 1. ſeems at firſt as if Timothy had not a right to *rebuke* an Elder; but when we compare that paſſage with the others,

The word *Deacons* occurs but in *one Chapter* (except Phil. i. 1. before-mentioned) namely, 1 Tim. iii.—Διακονος oftener; *Miniſters* about five times, but not as the name of an office; *Servants*, or *Inſtruments* would have ſerved the purpoſe as well.—It is commonly ſaid, that *Deacons* were appointed, Acts vi.—the perſons ordained to an œconominal office are not *called* ſo: nay, thoſe who were *not* appointed, are ſaid to perſevere in the Διακονια—τȣ λογȣ, as the others in the Διακονια τῆ καθημερινῃ.—*Paul* was a Διακονος[e].

Such are the *Scriptural* Facts with regard to our three ranks of perſons Επισκοπος, Πρεσβυτερος, and Διακονος. I have meant to make a complete enumeration of them: they ſeem to confirm our notion, that *any one* may be *all three*; though the Επισκοπος is ſuperior to the two others. I have ſeen no mention of any authority in the πρεσβυτερος over the Διακονος[f]: nor do I ſee *all three* mentioned *together*, in Scripture.

III. We come next to the *Apoſtolic Fathers*. Firſt premiſing from Bingham[g], that the *Grecian* and

others, the meaning ſeems rather to be, that though in ſtrictneſs he might rebuke an Elder, yet on account of his youth, and the age of the Elder, it might be adviſeable for him to ſoften his rebuke into an intreaty: nay, his youth might make it more becoming in him to uſe gentleneſs even towards younger Chriſtians.—Rebuke not, *but*, ſeems to have ſomething of *compariſon* in it; or a *preference* of one mode to another; both in ſtrictneſs allowable.

[e] 1 Cor. iii. 5.—2 Cor. xi. 23.—On this ſubject one might read Lardner, Vol. 2. of his works, Preface, page vii. ix.—And one might aſk, why St. Stephen and the perſons ordained with him (Acts vi.) have been called *Deacons*. Even the accurate Dr. Powell, page 366, calls them ſeptem Diaconos.

[f] That the Διακονος might be of dignified rank, appears from Bingham's account of Archdeacons, 1. 21. 1. 3. — An Archdeacon was the head of the Deacons, and was ſometimes made a Biſhop.—See alſo Bingham, 2. 10. 5.

[g] Bingham, 9. 1. 1.

and *Roman* cuſtom in forming *civil* ſocieties in Towns and Cities, was not unlike what has been now mentioned.—Each Town or City was governed by a *Senate*, and by a chief Magiſtrate, who was, at the ſame time a *Senator*, and *above* the Senate. The Council had the names of Βουλη, and *Senatus*, *Ordo*, *Curia*; and the Magiſtrate was called *Dictator*, or *Defenſor Civitatis:* his authority extended to a little *diſtance* round the city[h].

Now it ſeems as if the Apoſtles and their ſucceſſors, in planting *Churches*; had formed ſocieties ſimilar to theſe, leaning a little more or leſs to the Monarchical, or Democratical forms, according to the abilities and diſpoſitions of the *perſons*, and the *cuſtoms* of the place. So that, the combinations of power admitting of ſo great a variety of forms, it might happen, that no two Chriſtian Churches had preciſely the ſame form of Government.

Clemens Romanus, writing to, and therefore about, the Church of *Corinth*, fixed in a Grecian mercantile city, ſpeaks as St. Paul does writing about the Church of *Philippi:* he mentions only Επισκοποι and Διακονοι[i].—He laments a perſon's being depoſed τῆς Επισκοπῆς—from the ſuperintendence: and then adds, happy are (not the Επισκοποι, but) the *Elders* who cannot be depoſed; who are fixed immoveable in *Heaven*[k]. He alſo, according to Lord King, makes ἡγουμενοι, which was a name for *Biſhops*,

[h] The ſettlement now (1792) fixing at *Sierra Leone*, is governed by a Superintendent and Council.

[i] Clemens Rom. 1. Ep. ad Corinthios, Edit. Ruſſel, (Patres Apoſtol.) Sect. 42. compared with 44.——Επισκοποι in the plural, in one church, muſt, I ſhould think, imply ſome kind of Council: even if Epiſcopi were a few leaders, they would conſult together.

[k] Ibid page 170, 171.

Biſhops, equivalent to Πρεσβυτεροι[l]. He ſpeaks of *ſubjection* to Preſbyters.

Polycarp alſo writes to the *Philippians*, and of courſe, of the Church at Philippi; a town in Europe, of Grecian manners and cuſtoms, probably; I do not ſee that he mentions *Biſhops*; but he exhorts the Philippians to be ſubmiſſive to the *Preſbyters*[m] *and Deacons*. Yet he himſelf was Biſhop of Smyrna, and writes from thence; in his own name, and the name of the *Preſbyters* who were[n] *with him*.—Compare his *Preſbyters and Deacons*, with Paul's *Biſhops and Deacons*, when addreſſing the *ſame* Church, and they will ſeem to mean the *ſame Officers*.—I ſhould conjecture, that a *monarchical* Form of church-government, had *never* place at Philippi.

Ignatius was biſhop of Antioch in Syria: and from thence he was dragged, even to Rome, to be torn in pieces by wild beaſts: on his way, he was ſuffered to ſtop at *Smyrna*, with Polycarp, the Biſhop there. From thence he wrote to the Romans; and to three Churches near him; to the Epheſians, Magneſians, and Trallians. And afterwards, when he had proceeded farther on his journey, he wrote from Troas to Polycarp[o], and alſo

[l] Lord King's Primitive Church, page 89.—Clem. Ep. Sect. 57. page 210, Ruſſel, and page 211, note;—Των ἡγουμενων ἡ πρεσβυτερῶν.

But I find one or two places where ἡγουμενοι ſeems to me to mean *civil* Magiſtrates, and πρεσβυτεροι *old* men; the *aged*: ſee Sect. 1. (page 8.) and Sect. 21. (page 94.)—And does not the laſt ſentence in Sect. 40. mean three *orders* of Chriſtian *Miniſters*? *Levite* was not uncommon amongſt Chriſtians for a lower order of Church Miniſters, or Clergymen: and the context here is about Chriſtians. For ſubjection to Preſbyters, ſee Chap. or Sect. 57.

[m] Polycarp. ad Philipp. Sect. 5.

[n] Inſcription.—Could συν αυτῳ πρεσβυτεροι, imply Συμπρεσβυτεροι? *Fellow* Preſbyters?

[o] Ad Pol. Cap. 12.

alſo to Polycarp's Church, the Church of *Smyrna*; and to that of Philadelphia. In *all* the Epiſtles, except that to the Romans, which relates to himſelf and the ſufferings which awaited him at Rome, he mentions diſtinctly our *three orders*, Biſhops, Preſbyters, and Deacons: and ſays very ſtrong things in favour of ſubjection to the two former, eſpecially *Biſhops*.—I may read to you, of the Epiſtle to the Church of Smyrna, Chap. or Sect. 8. 9. 12.—Of that to *Polycarp*, (which changes from ſingular to plural number), Chap. 6.—Of that to the *Epheſians*, Chap. 6. and Chap. 2. where ſubjection is injoined, to *Biſhop and Preſbytery*; as it is in Chap. 4.—Of that to the *Magneſians*, Chap. 2. and 6.—The Biſhop at Magneſia was *young*, which gives Ignatius more opportunity of contending for his epiſcopal authority: he mentions the Biſhop as being in the *place* of God; and the Preſbytery as being in the place or ſituation συνεδριω των Αποστολων[p]; and the *Deacons* as being intruſted with the Διακονια Ιησυ Χριστυ: adorning this part with words; perhaps in order to make the want of power and authority leſs perceivable.—Of the Epiſtle to the *Philadelphians*, I might read the Inſcription.—Of that to *Trallium*, Chap. 2. and 3. and 7. and 12. where the Elders are to αναψυχειν τον Επισκοπον, refocillare Epiſcopum; and 13, where the Church is to be ſubject to the Biſhop and Preſbytery[q].

From theſe paſſages I conclude, that the government of Chriſtian Churches was more *monarchical* in *Aſia Minor* than in *Europe*; particularly than at *Philippi*, and that mart of Commerce, *Corinth*. And

[p] Compare Ign. ad Smyrnæos, Cap. 8. ad Trall. 2.

[q] Dr. Powell would not have objected to this plain enumeration of *Facts*.—See his Theſis, in his Volume, page 364.—"Quis enim, poſt immenſos," &c.

And if we ſuppoſe a greater diſpoſition towards Deſpotiſm in the Aſiatics, and towards Republicaniſm in the Europeans, allowing perhaps ſomething for the great *perſonal* weight of Polycarp, Ignatius and others, the difference may be ſufficiently accounted for.

If there was any Form of Church Government which was properly Chriſtian, how can one account for Polycarp's inculcating a kind of ſubjection to the Philippians, different from that which his own Church (at Smyrna) was exhorted to pay, by Ignatius? Polycarp alſo ſends to the Philippians thoſe Epiſtles of Ignatius, which inculcate ſubjection to Επισκοποι; not *becauſe* they do that, but becauſe they contain Πιστιν και ὑπομονην και πασαν οικοδομην, &c. (Pol. ad Phil. Sect. 13.) However, the difference of language as to ſubjection would thus be generally underſtood: the exhortations to ſubmit to Biſhops would be known to Churches of the moſt republican form, and vice versâ.

We muſt not let our prejudices lead us to imagine, that a primitive Biſhop of Smyrna was anything like a modern Biſhop of Durham; any more than that *King* Romulus was like Louis Quatorze, or a Perſian Monarch.

IV. We have now gone through the moſt ſignificant part of our Hiſtory. As Chriſtianity ſpread, it filled whole provinces; theſe were divided with ſome ſort of analogy to the civil diviſions[x] found actually ſubſiſting. And it muſt generally be moſt convenient to have the place of public *reſort* for civil affairs, to be the ſame with that for eccleſiaſtical buſineſs; people can moſt eaſily get to it; and the circumſtances which made it moſt convenient for the one, will generally make it moſt ſo

[x] Bingham, Book 9. Chap. 1.

ſo for the other. The more complex public worſhip grew, the more officers would be wanted, and orders would become more *diſtant:* Biſhops would become higher Officers, Deacons lower.—At the Council of *Nice*, Paphnutius ſpoke[s] of three orders as we ſhould: and ſo ſpoke Auguſtin[t]. —The *Aërians*[u] conſidered Biſhops and Preſbyters as the ſame; but they ſeem to have been ſingular in this; at leaſt our notion was by far the moſt common[x].

It has been before obſerved that the *Waldenſes* had ſomething like our three Orders.—Art. XXIII. Sect. IV.

V. I am not aware[y] of anything farther worth mentioning till the time of the *Reformation*. Then that great change took place of ordaining wholly, in ſome churches, by *Elders*.—And at that time, there was an idea of contracting *Dioceſes*[z], or making many more, and therefore many more Biſhops, in a given ſpace.

We mentioned, under the twenty-third Article, Sect. VI, the Lutheran Superintendents, and the ideas of ordaining amongſt Preſbyterians and the Independent Congregations. But we did not mention,

[s] See Council of Nice, in Socrates, I. 11. and Suidas.

[t] Ep. 21. repeatedly.—Aug. is *anxious* about not being *fit* to be a Prieſt; he would ſtudy, &c. and writes for a *Biſhop's* advice.

[u] See Lardner's Works, Vol. 4. page 306.

[x] See Baxter on Councils, page 81. the 22d Canon of the Council of Milevis, A. D. 416.—And ſeveral inſtances from Clem. Alex.—Origen, and Tertullian, in Nicholls on Common Prayer, on the Preface to the forms of Ordination. And that expreſſion of Apoſtolic Canon 2. 'Let a Preſbyter be ordained by *one* Biſhop,' ſhews, that Preſbyter and Biſhop could not always be ſynonymous.

[y] Art. XXIII. Sect. IV.—Neal ſays, that *Wickliffe* held only two orders; Biſhops *or* Preſbyters, and Deacons, I. page 3.—Wickliffe ſeems to have had ſome Puritanical authority.

[z] Bingham's Works, I. 409. folio.

mention, that the Engliſh Forms of ordaining Biſhops and Prieſts were, at the time of the Reformation, leſs plainly diſtinct from each other than they are now. However, the act of *Uniformity*, made upon the Reſtoration, requires us to aſſent to our preſent Article according to the Forms now in uſe[a], which were only compoſed in 1661, or 1662.—Biſhop Burnet mentions a ſcruple in the time of Queen Elizabeth, which occaſioned Parliament, and the compilers of our Article to look back, and to declare all Ordinations valid ſince the end of the ſecond year of Edward VI. which had been performed according to the Book compoſed and publiſhed, in the third year of King Edward, though not ratified by Parliament till his fifth year.

Anciently, all Biſhops were appointed[b] by *Election*. But Elections grew too tumultuous, and the appointment got into the hands of a *few*: it occaſioned great diſputes between the *Popes* and the Sovereigns of Europe; but our Henry VIII. ſettled

[a] See the end of the Act of Uniformity in the fourteenth year of Charles II.——And Bennet's Directions.——See alſo Moſheim, 8vo. Vol. 4. page 91. add Neal, 1. page 43.——I do not ſeem to underſtand Neal in this paſſage; he ſeems to ſpeak as if in King Edward's time, in 1549, our forms of ordaining, or conſecrating, had been the *ſame* for Biſhops and Prieſts; whereas they are only the ſame in things *common* to both ranks: as about ſtudying the Scripture, and oppoſing Hereſy. In other things they differ.—And the principal difference between King Edward's Forms and thoſe made at the Reſtoration of Charles II. conſiſts in this; in the old ones words of *Scripture* were uſed, addreſſed to Timothy *as* Biſhop, (2 Tim. i. 6, 7.) and in the new ones the *word* Biſhop was uſed; and ſo of *Prieſt*.

[b] Bingham, Book 4. Chap. 2. — Stillingfleet, Unreaſ. of Separ. part 3.—Clem. Rom. Ep. Sect. 44. page 168. Edit. Ruſſel.—For Elections growing tumultuous, ſee Bingham, 4. 2. 6. —Baxter on Councils, page 66. (and, I think, page 99. 101.) —Nicholls on the words, "The elected Biſhop," &c. and Dr. Powell's Theſis, in his Volume, page 365.

tled the matter in England, as it now is; giving a *Congé a'élire* to a Chapter, but puniſhing them if they did not elect[c] the perſon whom he nominated. Biſhop Warburton conſiders ſuch patronage as a compenſation made by the[d] Church to the ſtate for protection, and for the uſe of a compulſive force.

VI. Moſheim[e] ſays, that the *Socinians* (the early ones I ſuppoſe) have *four* ſacred orders; to our three they add that of *Widows*; why not *Deaconeſſes* alſo, like the Puritans? or thoſe mentioned 1 Cor. xii.?—I do not ſee Widows mentioned in the Racovian Catechiſm.

VII. If we wiſh to ſee what the Council of Trent ſays on our preſent ſubject, we may read the fourth, fifth, ſixth, and ſeventh Canons of the twenty-third Seſſion[f].—With regard to uninterrupted ſucceſſion of Biſhops, we have ſaid enough before; as well as upon the ſubject of re-ordaining.—And upon the Puritanical notion, that all rules are to be derived from Scripture. In Strype's Annals, we have an account of a Puritan Profeſſor at Cambridge, *Cartwright*, who was complained of to the Chancellor of the Univerſity for having held, that "*Officia et nomina impietatis*," are introduced into our Church; meaning Archbiſhops, &c. —Cambridge was then "a Neſt of Puritans."—According to the Article of 1552, people, in ſubſcribing to it, ſubſcribed to the *Liturgy*; but in 1562, aſſent to the Liturgy became unneceſſary: how

[c] Blackſtone, Index, Congé d' élire.

[d] Warburton's Alliance.

[e] Moſheim, octavo, Vol. 4. page 185, Note.

[f] For the things mentioned in theſe ſixth and ſeventh Sections, ſee Art. XXIII. Sect. VII. XI.—John Burges, page 3. 26. 42. —Strype's Annals, Vol. 1. page 583. A. D. 1570.—Neal, Vol. 1. page 190. 428. where is our 7th Canon of 1604.—Dr. Powell, page 28.

how the Church was again driven into requiring it, Dr. John Burges ſhews in very few words; and at the ſame time that he accounts for our ſubſcription to the *Liturgy* in general, he declares, that he only aſſents to the *uſe* of it, and the ſame of the *rites* of our Church.

But it is time to put an end to our Hiſtory: I will only mention then one or two things briefly. —*Bingham* expreſſes, in 1726, a wiſh[g], that *Dioceſes* could be *contracted*, according to the idea of our Reformers.—Mr. *Granville Sharp's* notion of a right appointment of a Miniſter, is, that he ſhould be appointed as *Matthias* was[h]; by *lot*, out of *two* fixed upon by ſuffrages of the Church.

Dr. Powell's Theſis is to be much recommended, in which he proves, that neither the Church-Government of England, nor that of Scotland, is repugnant to the Law of Nature, or to the Word of God. It contains all the Elements of Religious Society, expreſſed in the beſt manner.

Dr. John *Burges*[i] told King James, (&c. as before), that with regard to our preſent ſubject, he did not mean to expreſs approbation of every phraſe, &c. in the Ordinations, but only to declare, that our *calling* and ordination was, on the whole, ſuch as not to be deemed unlawful, or contrary to the word of God.—His ſenſe was accepted as the right one.

The *Romaniſts* ſeem to make the ſame three Orders which we make. See Council of Trent, the ſixth Canon of the twenty-third Seſſion.—As to Nicholls's ſaying, that they make Biſhop and Prieſt

[g] Bingham, 1. page 409. folio.

[h] Acts i. 26.—This is what Mr. Granville Sharp has mentioned to me, in Converſation. I hope I have rightly underſtood him.

[i] Burges, page 26.

Prieſt equal, *becauſe* the Prieſt can make his God, and the Biſhop can do no more, that is charging *conſequences* of opinions, contrary to our ſixth Canon of Controverſy. Book II. Chap. V. Sect. VI.

Dupin, diſputes the validity of ſome Engliſh Ordinations in *Theory*, but would allow them in practice, if an union took place[k].

VIII. We now come to *Explanation*.

In the title, "Miniſters" includes Prieſts and Deacons.

"In the time of Edward VI." there were two Reviews of the Liturgy; one in the ſecond, and the other in the fifth of Edward VI. but only[l] one form of ordination: we have no concern with this matter now, as we ſubſcribe to the Forms made at the Reſtoration.

"Doth contain all things *neceſſary*;"—this is modeſt: it is not ſaying, that our Forms are the *moſt rational* and ſcriptural that ever were or could be made; nor even that they are not defective; but only, that they have no ſuch capital defect as to deſtroy the *eſſence* of an ordination.

Neither have our forms anything in them that "is *ſuperſtitious* and *ungodly*:" they may be inelegant, unbecoming, injudicious; but they cannot be called ſuperſtitious or *impious*,—in Latin, *impium*; which reminds one of Cartwright's "officia et nomina *impietatis*." "*We decree*," is the ſame ſtile of *Injunction* that was remarked in Art. XXXV.

The expreſſions amount only to this, that our Forms have no defect or fault ſo great as to annul our Ordinations.

IX. And

[k] Appendix Third to Maclaine's Moſheim.

[l] So I gather from Burnet on the Article; and Neal under Edward VI.—Yet *Nicholls* mentions ſomething which was different in the firſt and ſecond books of Edward VI.—the Ordination Oath.

IX. And now with regard to *Proof*, what ſhall we ſay? all that we have to prove is, that 'the Engliſh Ordinations are valid; or not invalid.'—If every Church can ſettle its own rites, the thing is proved; and that this is the truth, muſt appear from the Hiſtory now given, and from what has gone before, in the twenty-third Article. From theſe we are led to conclude, that it is our buſineſs, and our duty, to adopt that Form of Church-Government which falls in beſt with our circumſtances and habitual notions: that it would be wrong therefore to have a monarchical Church-Government in a ſmall republic, or a republican one in a large monarchy.

Indeed we might go through our Forms, and defend the ſeveral expreſſions we meet with; but that would be unneceſſary labour; a better plan would be, to ſee what *Objections* have been made to them; or what *difficulties* they have occaſioned; if theſe admit of ſolution, we may take for granted that the reſt is unexceptionable.

X. Thus we are led to indirect proof:—and the objections are ſuch, that we may propoſe them *together*, and ſo anſwer them without interruption. That Orders is no Sacrament, has been ſhewn under the twenty-fifth Article; and the word "*called*" has been explained at large. Nor need we take farther notice of the Romiſh arguments againſt our Ordinations.

1. Is it right to have officers in the Church whoſe very *names*[m] are not found in Scripture; as *Archbiſhops*, *Archdeacons*, &c.?

2. We

[m] This was the notion of Profeſſor Cartwright before-mentioned; ſome of the other notions might be found in *Strype's Annals*, in the years 1570 and 1573, in the affairs of Cartwright, Dering, &c.—*Dering* is mentioned, Vol. 2. page 271.

2. We meet with *three names*, indeed, Επισκοπος, Πρεσβυτερος, and Διακονος, but we have no right to conclude from thence that there were *three* diſtinct *Ranks*.

3. And ſuppoſing there were, *Biſhops* ought not to be men of worldly *dignity*;

4. Nor Preſbyters, now called *Prieſts*, ſo far inferior to Biſhops, as they are made in the Church of England.

5. Nor ought Deacons, appointed originally for purpoſes of *œconomy*, to be ſo much of ſpiritual and *clerical* perſons as the Engliſh make them.

6. Then, making eccleſiaſtical ordinations, or truſts, to have any *dependence* on *temporal* powers, in the way of *patronage*, or otherwiſe, is contrary to the nature of Chriſt's ſpiritual kingdom. Such ordinations muſt want completing[n] by ſcriptural *Preſbyteries*.—Theſe ſix objections are all of the puritanical caſt.

7. But it has alſo occaſioned *difficulty*, that candidates for Deacon's orders are aſked whether they truſt that they "are inwardly *moved* by the *Holy Ghoſt* to take upon" them the office of Deacon.

8. And, that the ordaining Miniſters undertake to *convey the Holy Ghoſt* to thoſe whom they ordain.—Now in effect we have already replied to moſt of theſe objections and difficulties; but a word or two directly oppoſed to them, may have its uſe.

XI. When Biſhops become numerous, they muſt have ſome *ſubordination* ſettled amongſt them, elſe they could not act jointly, or with unity.—That

He writes to Lord Burghley for relief.—I think Lord Burghley was both Miniſter of State and Chancellor of the Univerſity of Cambridge.—"Of collectors for the poor, *or Deacons*"—is a ſynodical title of the Puritans, in 1576. Neal, 1. 232.

[n] See Bingham, French Church, Book 4. Chap. 5.—Neal's Hiſt. Pur. Vol. 1. page 233.—Gawton's Letter to the Biſhop of Norwich after deprivation.

That ſubordination might ſometimes be tacit, through general reſpect to ſome great and good Prelate; but ordinarily it muſt be by means of authority expreſsly given. And ſuch authority requires an official *name*[o] to denote it, and make it inſtantly felt. There is nothing more in giving ſuch names, than providing that all things "be done decently and in order."—If there are many *Overſeers*, how can order be maintained without an *Head*-overſeer?—But it muſt not be thought that the names of Archbiſhop and Archdeacon were invented by the Church of England: they have exiſted ever ſince they were wanted. Metropolitans and Archdeacons have been known in the Church theſe fourteen hundred years.—Nay, we might have Jerom's authority for adding *Archpreſbyters*[p].

XII. Suppoſing it were allowed that there were only two orders in the Church of *Philippi*, or *Corinth*; though to me it ſeems probable that the Επισκοποι might be ſuperior to the ordinary Preſbyters; yet there can be no doubt but the *Aſiatics* had *three orders*, and only *one* Biſhop in each church. Let then the Preſbyterians have a *Council* to govern them, I ſee no harm; but let *us* not be *blamed* for having Biſhops. If all are to go by *Scripture*, why do not ſeparatiſts imitate the orders, or ranks, mentioned 1 Cor. xii. 28. and Eph. iv. 11.? Our opinion is, that we are to have what, in our circumſtances, beſt anſwers, according to our judgment, the ends of religious ſociety. We conceive, that Chriſt no more inſiſted on a Preſbytery without Biſhop, than on Aldermen without Mayor; or than on the newly appointed

[o] See the reaſon for giving the unſcriptural name *Sacrament*, Art. xxv. Sect. xi.—Chriſt is αρχιποιμην, 1 Pet. v. 4.

[p] Bingham, Book 2. Chap. 16 and 21.

appointed Council of Sierra Leone without Superintendent.

XIII. Why Biſhops ſhould have worldly *dignity*, ſome reaſons have been given in the third[q] Book. "Let no man *deſpiſe* thee," ſays St. Paul to Titus[r], ſpeaking of the exertion of ſpiritual authority: if the injunction be not for Titus, but his flock, ſtill it lays an obligation on them, and on *all*, to prevent the *contempt of the Clergy*.—We have no good reaſon to think, that Chriſt had any objection to Kings being *nurſing-fathers* to his Church, or that if St. Paul were now alive, he would ſay, that Chriſtian Biſhops ſhould not "ſtand[s] before Kings," and in ſuch a form as would help to promote the right ſpirit of courtly aſſemblies.—At firſt, Chriſtians could only *pray* for Kings[t] and for all that were in authority; but other means of promoting the good ends of civil government, they never ſeem to have avoided, as things not belonging to them. The revenues of the Church have been ſometimes applied too much to purpoſes of Luxury; but ſuppoſe a well-choſen Biſhop to conſider them as a *truſt*, and to diſpenſe them in promoting virtue, piety, and learning; in furniſhing libraries, &c. &c. (which is the only right idea of them), they would be of immenſe value to the public. The Goſpel was to be preached to all *nations*: a nation, as ſuch, might become Chriſtian, of whatever ranks and orders it conſiſted.

XIV. *Preſbyters*[u] or *Prieſts*, may not be, in all reſpects, what they originally[x] were; all things muſt

[q] Book III. Chap. XIV. Sect. VIII.
[r] Titus ii. 15.
[s] Prov. xxii. 29. [t] 1 Tim. ii. 2.
[u] Preſbyter, Preſtre, Prêtre, Prieſt. (Nicholls).
[x] Lardner, who ſeems to hold but two ranks, ſays Preſbyters were to preach, reprove, rebuke, &c. Works, Vol. 2. Introd. page ix.

muſt yield, muſt dilate, contract, and ſuit themſelves to utility, in different circumſtances. As the Church encreaſed, and more nations came into it, Biſhops grew higher, Deacons lower; Prieſts were *intermediate*; though even then the three ranks were only ſuch as *Clemens* deſcribes.—The civil Magiſtrate found himſelf induced, and called upon, to interfere; this might take off from the *ruling*[y] of the Preſbyters, and turn them more to teaching and miniſterial offices.—Only let us not have two different ideas of the ſame word, and diſpute as if we had the ſame. Such contention muſt be endleſs.

XV. It ſeems right that we ſhould have ſuch *inferior miniſters* as we want; as to their official name being *Deacon*, it is of no conſequence. I do not know that, according to Scripture, *Stephen* was a Deacon more than St. *Paul*[z]. Nor do I ſee, that *Euſebius*[a] calls Stephen a Deacon. But if he had been called Deacon, he certainly did ſpiritual offices; *Philip* baptized the Æthiopian, Stephen worked miracles, and harangued the Jews. He would not have been *ſtoned* for ſerving *tables*.

XVI. Unleſs civil power ſupports religious ſociety, the maintaining of it ſeems quite *impracticable*; as we have before obſerved. Suppoſe a company of *Players* choſe to profane the *Lord's Day* at *Edinburgh*, where it is kept with great ſtrictneſs, how would the church of Scotland prevent the profanation by any power merely eccleſiaſtical?—Thoſe who maintain, that "Chriſt was the

[y] 1 Tim. v. 17.

[z] 1 Cor. iii. 5. as before, Sect. 11.—Rom. xv. 8. Chriſt was Διακονος περιτομης.

[a] Beginning of his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.—*Ignatius* ſeems to conſider Deacons (that is, Διακονοι reckoned *with* Επισκοποι and πρεσβυτεροι) in a *ſpiritual* light. Ου γαρ βρωματων και ποτων εισιν διακονοι, αλλ' εκκλησιας Θεου υπηρεται.—Ad Trall. Sect. 2.

the only Lawgiver in his[b] Church," muſt give up in *practice* what they hold in *theory*[c].—But of this enough before.—The nature of *Patronage* was mentioned juſt now.

After all, the general deſigns of the Puritans, to ſtrengthen religious *diſcipline*, to make it pervade every order of men, and notice every immoral act, ſeem to me very[d] laudable. Nay, it is no way neceſſary, for our preſent buſineſs, even to determine which mode of Church-government is beſt, theirs or ours; perhaps neither may be good abſolutely, in all circumſtances; nor either bad in certain ſituations: our Article only aſſerts, that ours is not radically faulty, ſo as to have no efficacy; ſo as not to retain the eſſence of a Church[e]. —The remaining difficulties may be more amongſt ourſelves.

XVII. As to the queſtion, "do you truſt that you are inwardly *moved by the Holy Ghoſt* to take upon you this office," &c. it cannot occaſion much difficulty to any one who has accuſtomed himſelf to obſerve the manner in which every good action or purpoſe, is, in ſcripture, *referred* to the Holy Spirit. This was our *ſubject* in Art. x. and has been ſeveral times mentioned ſince.—Phil. ii. 13. —James i. 17. might revive former ideas. Theſe things conſidered, the queſtion amounts to no more than this, Are you *conſcious of good intentions* in your preſent undertaking? are you "in all things[f] *willing* to *live honeſtly*," in the ſituation to which you aſpire?—Beſides, a candidate is only aſked whether he *truſts* that he is moved; this implies uncertainty,

[b] Neal 1. page 233, as before.
[c] See Dr. Powell's Theſis, page 369, top.
[d] Neal 1. page 232. Claſſes.
[e] See Archbiſhop Wake to Pere Courrayer, July 9, 1724.—Moſh. Cent. 18. Sect. 23. 8vo. Vol. 5. page 94. Note.
[f] Heb. xiii. 18.

uncertainty, and entirely excludes enthuſiaſtic preſumption: indeed as the Reformers were no enthuſiaſts, a man might aſſure himſelf beforehand, that they had no enthuſiaſtic meaning.

Similar enquiries might be made of one entering into any other profeſſion, where he might poſſibly have an end in view diſtinct from the good of that profeſſion.—Do you really mean to make a good *Soldier*, or only to wear a gay uniform? are you *inſpired* by a true martial *ſpirit?* So, do you really mean to make a good *miniſter*, or only a tithe-gatherer, or a lounger?—But if this be the meaning, you will ſay, why not remove all difficulties by aſking the queſtion in the words which now explain its meaning? I ſuppoſe the reaſon is, becauſe the phraſe uſed, is moſt *ſcriptural*; eſpecially for *Deacons*; (indeed the queſtion is not propoſed to Prieſts, or Biſhops;) to ſee this, one need only read Acts vi. 3. 5. (which is transferred into our queſtion,) and conſider circumſtances. *Seven* men are choſen, to make a fair diſtribution of what bounty has thrown into a common ſtock: a qualification for this *temporary* office was that all *ſeven* muſt be "*full of the Holy Ghoſt*," as well as have a good character, and prudence; that is, knowledge of accounts, market-prices, &c.—We can immediately ſee the propriety of ſuch men having a good character, and being prudent; being full of the Holy Ghoſt is a phraſe not now familiar; we muſt conſider with what it is *joined:* it muſt mean ſome requiſite for managing the *temporal* concerns of religious ſociety: might it mean, full of an holy temper? intereſted about Religion? a good temper or intention is to be *referred* to the Holy Ghoſt.—But there are many other texts which tend the ſame way, and would ſerve to confirm thoſe who framed the queſtion, in their purpoſe —Luke i. 15.

Acts

Acts vii. 55.—ix. 17.—xi. 24.—xiii. 52.—xx. 28. —2 Pet. i. 21.—Theſe and others would ſerve alſo to make the phraſe more familiar to *us*; and thereby remove our greateſt difficulty in the uſe of it.

XVIII. When our ordaining Miniſter ſays, "Receive the Holy[g] Ghoſt for the office," &c. there can be no doubt of his uſing thoſe words of Scripture, John xx. 22.—In the office for Prieſts, he goes on to ver. 23. in that for Biſhops, he proceeds to 2 Tim. i. 6, 7.—John xx. 23. is an Ordination, or Conſecration.

This might be of an higher kind at firſt, than ſince, in the ordinary ſtate of the Church, as we have ſeen of ſeveral things; but what could be a more proper way of giving a commiſſion to preach, abſolve, &c. than repeating the words which our Lord uſed when he gave the *ſame* commiſſion; underſtanding them in a *lower ſenſe?* Suppoſe you had to compoſe a Form for the purpoſe: would you not ſay, This muſt not be expreſſed like a *ſecular* and civil appointment; it ſhould be expreſſed in ſome words of *Scripture.* "We preach not ourſelves[h], but Chriſt Jeſus the Lord:" we are not diſciples of Paul, or of Apollos, but of Chriſt: that commiſſion which Chriſt *gave*, we *hand down* from generation to generation; how can we more ſtrongly mark it for his, than by expreſſing it in his words?—As the Holy Ghoſt is to guide us into all truth, and as Chriſt is to be with his Church to the end of the world, it is not

[g] This is not the office of *Deacon*; he *truſts* he is *moved* by the Holy Ghoſt, and does *not receive* it: Prieſt and Biſhop think in their hearts that they are truly *called*, and *do receive* the Holy Ghoſt. Is anything particular meant by this?

[h] 2 Cor. iv. 5.

not to be imagined that any appointment of a ſacred miniſter can take place without ſome bleſſed heavenly *influence*; but it is not *man* who cauſes that influence, but Chriſt himſelf. Man only repeats a Form as *Agent* for him who inſtituted it. If man could convey any ſpiritual bleſſing by his own power, he would uſe his own words; the words uſed by an *Herald* when he proclaims war or peace, may ſound preſumptuous, as if he pretended to give one or the other; but they are not his own words; they are always underſtood to be the words of his *Sovereign*; and nothing but ſome great *abuſe*, can prevent their being effectual.

This form ſeems to have been quite eſtabliſhed in the time of Auguſtin[i], in the *Latin* Church: and in the *Greek* Church there has been in ordinations ſome mention of the Holy Ghoſt. Yet, in general, it is ſaid, that the Greek Forms have been more indicative, the Latin ones more optative or precatory[k]. As, '*mayeſt* thou receive the Holy Ghoſt.' Some have thought that *our* expreſſions might bear that ſenſe; like, 'Every good *attend* you.'—'Be *you* happy, whatever becomes of *me*,' &c.

XIX. As we do not ſeem to have occaſion for an *Application*, in this Article, I will cloſe my remarks upon it by a ſort of paraphraſe, of the words, "*Receive the Holy Ghoſt*," &c.

'As Jeſus Chriſt, when he ſent his Apoſtles to preach the Goſpel in all the world, gave them his commiſſion, and promiſed a ratification of their authority; and as it is his will that a Commiſſion, in kind the ſame, though of a lower Degree, ſhould

[i] Aug. de Trin. 15. 26. (Nicholls).

[k] See a like diſtinction in the Form of *Abſolution*; Art. XXV. Sect. IV.

ſhould be perpetually conferred for the benefit of his Church; I, heretofore regularly appointed, do confer the ſame on You; uſing the words of our Lord, as beſt conveying the nature of the *Truſt*; and leaving it to his unbounded wiſdom to fulfil them in that degree which ſhall ſeem to him, in any ſtate of his Church, moſt ſuitable and expedient.'

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXXVII.

OF THE CIVIL MAGISTRATES.

THE King's Majeſty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other his Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all eſtates of this Realm, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Civil, in all cauſes doth appertain; and is not, nor ought to be ſubject to any foreign Juriſdiction.

Where we attribute to the King's Majeſty the chief government, by which Titles we underſtand the minds of ſome ſlanderous folks to be offended; we give not to our Princes the miniſtering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments; the which thing the Injunctions alſo lately ſet forth by Elizabeth our Queen, do moſt plainly teſtify; But that only prerogative, which we ſee to have been given always to all godly Princes in holy ſcriptures by God himſelf; that is, that they ſhould rule all eſtates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be Eccleſiaſtical or Temporal, and reſtrain with the civil ſword the ſtubborn and evil-doers.

The Biſhop of Rome hath no juriſdiction in this Realm of England.

The Laws of the Realm may puniſh Chriſtian men with death, for heinous and grievous offences.

It is lawful for Chriſtian men, at the commandment of the Magiſtrate, to wear weapons, and ſerve in the wars.

1. The

I. The *Hiſtory* of this Article may conſiſt of *two* ſeparate Hiſtories: and the ſecond of them may include the Hiſtory of the two following Articles, the thirty-eighth and the thirty-ninth.—The firſt Hiſtory ſhould be of the *Pope's Supremacy*; the ſecond, of the notions of thoſe, who, aiming at *perfection*, reject ſome practices which are ordinarily reckoned uſeful or neceſſary in human Life: ſuch as governing by *Civil Magiſtrates*, inflicting *capital puniſhments*, carrying on *war*, poſſeſſing *property*, and taking *oaths* on ſolemn occaſions. That theſe may go *together*, will appear hereafter.

II. Firſt, we take the *Pope's Supremacy*: a great deal has been written on this ſubject, but it is now leſs intereſting than it was in the time of our Henry VIII.

Hiſtorians tell us, that Chriſtianity was planted in our Iſland ſo ſoon as the[a] Apoſtolic age; though it is not known what perſons firſt taught it to our Anceſtors. At the great Council of Nice in 325, it was underſtood, that the Britiſh Chriſtians were not brought under any foreign Patriarch or Metropolitan, but were an independent Church[b].—The Iſland was invaded by *Saxons*, who were then Idolaters; and Gregory the Firſt, (or the Great) ſent a Monk called *Auguſtin*, very early in the ſeventh Century, to convert them. He required the Britiſh Chriſtians to be in ſome ſubjection to the See of Rome, but they refuſed. The Saxons ſhewed more

[a] Collier's Eccleſ. Hiſtory, from Gildas, &c.—Comber's Advice, page 111.

[b] Can. 6. Dionyſ. Exig. referred to by Comber.—This Dionyſius, called the *Little* from his ſtature, was a Scythian by birth, but reſided at Rome; lived to near the middle of the ſixth Century; was famous for making a good collection of Canons, &c. and is ſaid to have been the beginner of our cuſtom of reckoning time from the birth of Chriſt. (Ladvocat.)

more reſpect to thoſe by whom they had been converted, but kept clear of ſubjection. At that time it appears, that the Biſhop of Rome, (who, like other Biſhops, was ſometimes called *Papa*, a reſpectful appellation,) was ſubject to the *Emperor*, and conſidered the Emperor as governing[c] *ſacred perſons*. Indeed the Emperors had always, till the time of Gregory VII. in ſome degree conferred the Popedom: he was the laſt Pope whoſe election was confirmed by the Emperor. The early Chriſtian Emperors had always ordered *Councils*, and preſided at them; how much authority they exerciſed over the Church, appears from a great many Roman Laws now extant in the Corpus Juris civilis.—Though the Popes, in the day of their greatneſs, aſſumed unbounded authority, yet in the early times of Chriſtianity, they had only that *precedence* which naturally aroſe from Rome being the ſeat of the Empire. Under the nineteenth Article we had occaſion to compare the ſee of Rome with thoſe of Jeruſalem, Alexandria, and Antioch[d]. Pope Victor, who died in 201, ſhewed a good deal of arrogance in the diſpute about Eaſter, and excommunicated ſome worthy[e] men who differed from him; but even thoſe of the *Latin* Church did not think it a duty to ſubmit.—The mild and good *Irenæus*[f] oppoſed him, and wrote to him a a letter, from himſelf and the Brethren in Gaul, ſtill extant in Euſebius.—About the year 372, *Valentinian*[g] publiſhed a law, by which, in order to avoid

[c] See Bower's Lives of Popes, Vol. 2. page 500. where Gregory I. ſays, that God gave the Emperor *dominari ſacerdotibus*.

[d] Art. XIX. Sect. II.

[e] See Lardner under *Polycrates*; Works, Vol. 2. page 243.

[f] Lardner, Vol. 2. page 157.—Euſeb. cap. 24.—Bower's Life of Victor.

[g] Biſhop Halliſax on Prophecy, page 336. from Moſheim.

avoid going to profane Tribunals, Biſhops were obliged to refer their diſputes to the ſee of Rome: this might be one reaſon why the papal pretenſions kept riſing till the Council of *Chalcedon*, in 450. At that Council it was held, that, as there were two ſeats of Empire, the two Prelates who preſided at them, ſhould be upon the *ſame rank*.— This continued till 580, when Conſtantinople claimed univerſal church-ſupremacy. But *Phocas*, an Emperor of flagitious character, being rather checked for his enormities by the Patriarch of Conſtantinople, and ſtrongly flattered by the[h] Pope, declared the latter the ſupreme Governor of the Catholic Church.

In the ninth Century the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches ſeparated. The Pope became a ſecular Prince, by the Revolt of the Exarchate of Italy, in the contentions about Images, which muſt help the growth of his ſpiritual dominion. He involved, at one time or other, moſt European Nations in great troubles; of which there ſeemed likely to be no end, ſo long as he could make religious terror, and other paſſions, operate on the minds of the ordinary ſubjects, and maintain a ſtrong feeling for the ſanctity of religious orders.— In *England* he gained an influence about the time of the Conqueſt, by aſſiſting the Conqueror; and from that time to the reign of Henry VIII. it was a perpetual conflict between the See of Rome and the rational part of the Engliſh Nation.

The Law, in Theory, was againſt the See of Rome, and during the reigns of Henry II. Edward I. and III. and Richard II. ſeveral Statutes were

[h] Gregory I. ſee his Life by Bower. Phocas died 610.— See Nicholls on the Ordination-oath.—Gregory's Letters to Phocas, are a great diſgrace to him.

were made, declaring the rights of England, and enforcing them. The Statutes of the Parliament at Clarendon, thoſe againſt *Proviſors*, and thoſe decreeing what is called a *præmunire*, are ſo well explained in Sir William Blackſtone's Commentaries, a Book to which every one has acceſs, that I need not dwell upon them: it is enough to mention them to the Student.

Civil wars kept the nation, for a long time, from exerting itſelf unanimouſly to regain its rights, and the Popes were always ready to take advantage of all diviſions.—Henry VIII. at firſt acted and wrote in defence of Popery, againſt Luther, from whence he got the Title of *Defender of the Faith*; but quarrelling with the Pope about a Divorce, he ſet himſelf earneſtly, with all the vehemence of a warm temper, and of princely loftineſs, to throw off the Papal Supremacy.—The occaſion might not be equally creditable with a pure ſenſe of rectitude, and a love of law and liberty; but yet the manner of conducting the emancipation of our[i] Church and State, ſeems to have been regular, legal, conſtitutional; and to have implied the recovery or declaration of an *old right*, detained for a while by mere violence.—The Supremacy of the Pope was rejected by Engliſh Papiſts: all the powers of the Nation united in rejecting it.

The *Neceſſary Doctrine*, on the Sacrament of *Order*, contains a good account of this matter; plain and clear; as for the *people:* the work of *Cranmer*, moſt probably, who was raiſed to eminence by his efforts to redeem the kingdom.—Thus Henry VIII. aſſumed the Title of Head of the Church, in ſpite of Bulls diſcharged againſt him

[i] Heylin, in his life of Archbiſhop Laud, page 1. has a ſhort account of this.—Neal's account is not long.

him from Rome; and his ſucceſſors have retained the Title, though Elizabeth thought fit to give an Explanation of it in her *Injunctions* mentioned in the Article, ſimilar to the explanation in the paragraph which refers to them.

Several attempts have been made, ſince the time of Elizabeth, to reſtore the Papal power; a ſhort and clear account of which may be found in Biſhop *Gibſon's* Poſtſcript to his fifth Paſtoral Letter.

Of late years, the Pope's power over the Engliſh Papiſts ſeems to have been much weakened. We have had about ſeventeen hundred of them avow this by ſigning their names: they call themſelves *Proteſting Catholics*. Parliament has paſt an act for their relief, taking place June 24, 1791. Yet even over theſe the Pope has ſome *ſpiritual* authority: their oath only imports, that they allow him "no *temporal* or *civil* juriſdiction" "within this Realm."—And even this Oath great numbers of Engliſh Papiſts cannot take.—Indeed, I believe the notion, that there ought to be *one Head* of the Church, and that the Biſhop of *Rome* has good pretenſions to that pre-eminence, is deeply rooted in the minds of many.—We are told, that even "many men of Learning and Piety," in the church of Rome, are ſenſible of its errors, but do not chuſe to ſeparate themſelves from what they eſteem the true Univerſal Church of Chriſt[k].

III. Having finiſhed our firſt Hiſtory, let us proceed to our ſecond.—Declining, through ſcruple, the uſe of thoſe expedients which the generality of ordinary men have adopted for the purpoſes of human life, has ariſen from a deſire of

[k] See ſecond Appendix to Moſheim's Hiſtory.—About Dr. *Courrayer*, page 110.—Comber too preſſes this point moſt of any. Advice, Sect. 6. page 110—136.

of attaining to *Perfection:* ſuch deſire is ſometimes a part of a mild, gentle, refined temper; ſometimes of an harſh and auſtere one.—The former, intent upon the good always likely to reſult from improvement; the latter dwelling on the faults and failures which ſeem to obſtruct it.

It muſt be owned, that Magiſtracy, capital puniſhments, war, property, and oaths, all imply great *imperfection.* If we were as we ought to be, and had amongſt us no "ſtubborn and evil-doers," we ſhould have no need of Magiſtrates (much leſs of *capital* puniſhments and war) nor even of riches, which occaſion ſo many diſſenſions, ſo much anxiety, and ſo many vicious acts.—If our veracity were to be relied on, oaths would be needleſs.—Theſe are real *evils,* though as they prevent greater evils, they are conſidered as benefits.—Every ſcruple proceeds upon ſomething in *Scripture.*

1. The prohibition of Magiſtracy, on Matt. v. 5.—xx. 25.—Gal. v. 1.

2. Of capital puniſhments on Matt. v. 21.—vi. 15.

3. War, on Matt. v. 39—44.

4. Riches, on Matt. vi. 19.—xix. 21—24.—Luke xvi. 19, &c. 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10.

5. Oaths, on Matt. v. 34. and James v. 12.

It does not happen, that every one who declines one or two of the things we are ſpeaking of, declines them all; ſome do not allow of oaths, or of war, who do allow of property; but the *turn* and temper ſeems to be much the ſame in all who decline any; variations are moſt likely to happen where there is the leaſt ſolid reaſoning and plain ſenſe: a particular taſte, connexion, intereſt, &c. may ſet ſome perſons, though of this temper,

upon juſtifying to themſelves ſome[l] one of the things in queſtion; and, in ſuch caſe, their arguings will rarely fail of ſucceſs.

IV. The *Pythagoreans* ſeem to have had a diſpoſition to decline ſome things, which common men make uſe of: their leader perſuaded the Sicilian Dames to ſtrip off their more ſplendid ornaments, and make an offering of them to a local Deity.—He made his followers ſell their patrimony, lay the produce at his feet, and live in common, without *property*.—He held, that *war* was only lawful on five occaſions, ſuch as againſt the paſſions, and ſo on; meaning, that it was never to be carried on with fire and ſword. He would not kill even[m] Brute Animals.—The neceſſity of Laws he ſaw too clearly to be miſled.—He therefore endeavoured to improve, not annihilate, Legiſlation.

V. Some of the Chriſtian Fathers may be next mentioned. *Lactantius* ſeems to make the commandment, "thou ſhalt not *kill*," to be univerſal; to admit of no exception whatſover: he is even againſt killing by word, as he calls it, that is, accuſing of a capital crime. God wills man to be ſanctum[n] animal. He would not have a man fight, as a ſoldier, in the juſteſt cauſe. What he ſays againſt fights of Gladiators, and the expoſing of children, appears to me to be very good, whatever the reſt may ſeem.

The *Manicheans* ſeem to have[o] been againſt *war*: *Auguſtin*[p], in oppoſing them, is clearly for juſt war; and

[l] Fielding deſcribes Col. Bath well, talking as a *Chriſtian* about *Duelling*.

[m] Ladvocat; collected from various Lives.

[n] Lactantius de vero Cultu, cap. 20.—A. D. 306.

[o] Lardner, Vol. 3. page 476.

[p] Aug. Contra Fauſtum, 22. 74.

and argues well in excuſe for it, calling Soldiers non homicidas ſed miniſtros Legis,—ſalutis publicæ defenſores.—Fauſtus had been arguing againſt the Old Teſtament, and had inſtanced in the wars of Moſes. Auguſtin ſays, quid culpatur in Bello?

The *Pelagians* were againſt *oaths*.—And againſt *Riches*[q]: they held, that a man ought not to *ſwear at all*;—and that *rich* converts muſt give up their whole ſubſtance, or Baptiſm would not profit them. Auguſtin oppoſed them in both theſe points, though he himſelf had given up his property, and had perſuaded ſome to do the ſame: as appears from his Letter to *Hilarius*, who had written from Sicily to inform Auguſtin of the Pelagian notions ſpreading there[r]. But ſeveral *Fathers* ſeem to have been againſt Oaths, thinking them allowed to *Jews*, but wholly forbidden to Chriſtians. As Baſil and Chryſoſtom: Jerom alſo and Gregory of Nazianzum might lean that way. Cyprian however ſeems to have been on our ſide; but, in early times, ſwearing was confounded with ſwearing by *Heathen Deities*; that would be reckoned wrong by *all*. *Vegetius* gives an account of the Oaths taken by *Chriſtian Soldiers*[s]: ſo that Chriſtians did enliſt, and had a *Sacramentum*; they alſo profeſſed to honour the Emperor next after God.

VI. The *Waldenſes* ſeem to have been very likely to take the turn of which we are ſpeaking. Accordingly,

[q] See the paſſages in Voſſius's Hiſt. Pelag. page 723. 727.—Wall on Bapt. page 179. 183.

[r] See Wall, 1. 19. 21. page 182, quarto.—The Pelagians had ſold their property, and condemned every one who did not.—Auguſtin had ſold his, and had perſuaded ſome to ſell theirs, but cenſured none who did not.

[s] Quoted by Voſſius, ibid. page 727.—See alſo Lardner, end of 8th Volume.

Accordingly, Moſheim informs[t] us, that—" Their Rules of practice were extremely auſtere; for they adopted as the model of their moral diſcipline, the Sermon of Chriſt on the Mount, which they interpreted and explained in the moſt rigorous and literal manner; and, of conſequence, prohibited and condemned in their Society, all *wars*, and ſuits of *Law*, all attempts towards the acquiſition of *wealth*, the inflicting of *capital* puniſhments, ſelf-defence againſt unjuſt violence, and *Oaths* of all kinds."

Maclaine, in his note on this paſſage, obſerves, that theſe perſons only meant to revive *Piety*, and oppoſe *abuſes*.

Wickliffe had ſuch a maſs of corruption to remove, that he might not at once diſcern what was *practicable:* he ſeems to have had a tendency to decline ſome of the uſages of which we are ſpeaking. At the Council of *Conſtance* one of his condemned propoſitions was, " *Oaths* made to ſtrengthen human contracts and civil commerce, are unlawful[u]."—And *Gilpin* tells us, he was againſt capital puniſhments, and thought war " utterly unlawful[x]."

Vows of *poverty* may be mentioned; eſpecially as they are generally attended with meekneſs, and ſet men at a diſtance from war and bloodſhed.—In France, about twenty years ago, the Convents of Monks living in poverty filled very ſlowly; they fell far ſhort of their complement.

The German *Anabaptiſts* are mentioned in our thirty-

[t] Moſheim, Cent. 12. 2. 5. 12. 8vo. Vol. 2. page 454.

[u] Baxter on Councils, page 433.

[x] Gilpin's Reformers, page 79, 80.—Collier's Eccleſ. Hiſt. 1. 631. mentions four Books of his on the Sermon on the Mount, and three Books of civil Government.

thirty-eighth Article.—I gave an account[y] of them formerly. *Luther*, who knew them well, deſcribes them in few words, as far as concerns our preſent purpoſe: docentes Chriſtiano[z] nihil eſſe *poſſidendum*, non *jurandum*, nullos magiſtratus habendos, non exercenda judicia, neminem tuendum aut defendendum, uxores et liberos deſerendos, atque id genus portenta quam plurima.—In Sleidan's[a] Hiſtory, *John Matthew* orders all goods to be in common, and people bring their goods to the common ſtock; partly, perhaps, through fear of two *propheſying Virgins*, who diſcovered all embezzling.—The Landgrave tells them, they mean to overturn all *Government*[b].—*Cheynell* ſays, "the *Anabaptiſts* go to ſea without any ordnance in their ſhips"—travel without any "ſword,"—one of them does "not think it lawful to be a *Cutler*[c]."

The firſt *Socinians* have been thought to originate from the Anabaptiſts[d]. In a note on Moſheim's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory[e] it is ſaid, "there is this peculiarity

[y] Art. VII. Sect. III.—There are ſome Acts of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. againſt them. See Burn, under *Diſſenters*.

[z] Pref. to Ennarations on Matt v, vi. vii fol. 1 page 2.—Works, Vol. 7. fol a paraphraſe on Chriſt's Sermon on the mount.

[a] The Latin title is, Commentaria de Statu Religionis et Reipublicæ, Carolo V. Cæſare. in 26 Books. It is tranſlated into Engliſh by Bohun.—See alſo Wall, page 414. 419. 425.

[b] The Anabaptiſts reſiſted Government by virtue of their *Chriſtian Liberty*.—Art. VII. Sect. III.—And becauſe Magiſtrates imply *imperfection*; Rogers, page 224.—Confeſſ. Augſb. 1. Cap. 17. the Godly ſhall *rule* and poſſeſs *the Earth*, at *laſt*; ergo begin *directly*.—See Moſheim, Cent. 16. 3. 2. 3. 16. 8vo. Vol. 4. page 153.

[c] Cheynell on Socinianiſm, page 51. (in T—5—38. Sid. Coll.)

[d] Moſheim, 8vo. Vol. 4. page 178. Cent. 16. 3. 2. 4. 8.

[e] Ibid. Sect. 10. page 185. 8vo. ſee alſo *Cheynell* on Socinianiſm, page 51, 52.—for connexion between Anabaptiſts and old Socinians.—He is ſpeaking of ſome ſort of Socinians when

peculiarity in their moral injunctions, that they prohibit the taking of *oaths* and the repelling of *injuries*."—The modern Socinians have not this peculiarity.

VII. The *reformed* Churches would be all earneſt to clear themſelves of the imputation of being ſeditious, and of favouring the Anabaptiſts. —The Helvetic Confeſſion condemns them expreſsly. The French mentions the error, about a community of Goods, as then ſubſiſting. The Scotch allows the Magiſtrates to purge Religion; —would it allow a *popiſh* Magiſtrate?—The Dutch much the ſame; and it ſpeaks of the Anabaptiſts, like our thirty-eighth Article, as to holding a community of goods. The Bohemian is ſtrongly againſt the Magiſtrate's interfering[f] in religious matters. The Auguſtan condemns the Anabaptiſts warmly; and mentions Magiſtracy, War, Oaths; and the belief of the actual final Dominion of the Saints.

VIII. I rather ſuſpect our Article of aiming at the *Puritans*[g]: blaming the Anabaptiſts for any puritanical error, would be a way of throwing odium upon the Puritans.—In the *Play* called the *Puritan*, one ſays, "We (Puritans) muſt not *ſwear*, I can

when he ſays, page 52. "God hath not given his people any earthly goods or poſſeſſions under the Goſpel;"—there is more of it: printed 1643.

[f] It might be inquired, whether thoſe who were for the magiſtrate's interfering in affairs of Religion, had not the Magiſtrate on their ſide? and thoſe who were againſt the magiſtrate's interfering, had not him for an adverſary?

[g] Rogers refers to a paſſage in the Preface to Hooker's Eccleſiaſtical Polity, in which it is ſaid, that Puritans made a practice of declining *oaths* in Courts of Law, when their brethren were under *proſecution*, and if they were ſworn, they would then be *ſilent*. But this ſeems nothing to a *Doctrine* of *unlawfulneſs* of oaths; only as it would *put* the Puritans upon making what *objections* they could, in their own defence.

I can tell you:"—"We may lie, but we muſt not ſwear:"—and, "No *rich* thing ſhall enter into Heaven, you know."—The character of *Corporal Oath* is probably intended to heighten the puritanical character, by contraſt[h].

IX. In or near 1573, there were a ſet of Chriſtians in the Iſle of *Ely*[i], who are ſaid to have mixed the notions of Gnoſtics, Arians, and Anabaptiſts.—They deduced from Matt. v. that they ought not to take any *oaths*; from the commandment, "thou ſhalt not *kill*," that all *capital* puniſhments are unlawful: and from Acts ii. 44, 45. that riches are unchriſtian. And they held other notions not connected with our preſent ſubject. They were thought worth denouncing to Government.

X. The *Family of Love* ſeem likely, from what has been already ſaid of them, to have run into the errors of which we are treating; and in the Proclamation of Elizabeth[k] againſt them, it is mentioned, that they would take an *Oath* before a Magiſtrate, and not ſcruple to *deceive* him if he was not one of their own ſect. However, Rogers on this Article refers to H. N.'s work, Spirit. Land. 6. 5, as railing at Magiſtracy, and to another work as encouraging men to accompliſh the dominion of the Saints. And alſo to paſſages condemning all *wars*, and prohibiting the uſe of all *weapons*.

The *Quakers* take up ſome notions which the Anabaptiſts[l] laid down; they hold all *war* to be unlawful;

[h] See the Play amongſt Shakſpeare's, Act 1. Scene 2 and 3. and Act 3. Scene 6. "*Peace* has more hidden oppreſſions, and violent heady ſins (though looking of a gentle nature) than a profeſſed *war*."—This is ſaid with a *view* to Puritans.

[i] See Collier's Eccleſ Hiſt. Vol. 2. page 545.

[k] Biſhop Sparrow's Collection, page 171.

[l] Burn, under *Diſſenters*.

unlawful; and all *oaths*; but they expreſsly allow of *property*, and difference of *ranks*. They ſpeak feelingly of the Civil *Magiſtrate's* interfering about *opinions*: but they ſeem to take for granted the lawfulneſs of his temporal authority[m]; and indeed their addreſſes to our King have been always loyal: —they ground their opinions on Scripture.—One might read an expreſſion or two of Warburton, in[n] his Alliance.

At the Reſtoration there[o] was a very ſevere act againſt the Quakers, the tendency of which was, to compel them to take Oaths; but at the Revolution their ſcruples found relief:—and I hope a ſufficient one.

The *Moravians*, who ſtile themſelves "*Unitas Fratrum*," or "United Brethren" are called by *Limborch*[p], *Communiſtæ*, as having goods in common; but I have known Perſons of Fortune members of that Community. Perhaps they might at firſt have one common ſtock. In 22 of George II. they had an act of Parliament to relieve them from taking Oaths; yet they make declarations "in the *preſence of God*[q]"—conſidering God as a "*Witneſs*." I obſerve they are called a "proteſtant *Epiſcopal*[r] Church."

XI. We may now proceed to *Explanation*.

Some, I think, have ſcrupled to ſign our Articles, becauſe it was originally, in the Articles of 1562, "the *Queen's* Majeſty," and not, "the *King's* Majeſty." Such a ſcruple requires a conſtant ſucceſſion of female ſovereigns.

"The

[m] Barclay's Apol. prop. 14. [n] Page 91. 121.
[o] Burn, under Diſſenters, 13 & 14. Chap. 2. c. 1.
[p] Limborch on Acts ii.
[q] Auguſtin would tell them that they do not know what ſwearing is. See Wall, 4to. page 185. Aug. ad Hilarium.
[r] Burn, under Diſſenters, 4to. page 525.

"The *chief* power"—in Latin, *ſummam* habet poteſtatem: which is ſometimes called the *ſupreme* or *ſovereign* power.

"Foreign juriſdiction," can only allude to the ſee of *Rome:* however, the general terms convey ſomething of reaſoning.—The firſt paragraph is againſt the *Papiſts*, the ſecond againſt the *Puritans*.

"*By which titles*," — ſupreme in eccleſiaſtical cauſes, ſupreme in civil cauſes: this ſeems to be the meaning; but the grammar ſeems ſcarcely accurate. This Article is made out of one of 1552; and there is more grammatical danger in alteration, than in original compoſition[s].

"Slanderous folks," are in Latin, *calumniatores:* the Puritans are meant.—The *Injunctions* ſpoken of are in Sparrow's Collection[t]: we may look at them.

"*Lately*"—in 1559.

"To all godly Princes in Holy Scriptures"—the act of a wicked pagan Prince, might not have made a good precedent.—But ſome ſcriptural precedents ſhould be mentioned.—Exod. xxxii. 22. Aaron ſubmits to the Lay-lawgiver, Moſes.—Deut. xiii. 5. A prophet inticing to Idolatry, is to be put to death.—1 Kings iii. 26. Solomon judges Abiathar.—2 Chron. xix. 5—9. Jehoſhaphat gives judicial powers to ſacred perſons.—xxix. 4, &c.—Hezekiah gives orders to the Levites.—See alſo ver. 11.—ver. 21. he commands the Sons of Aaron: ſee alſo ver. 31.—2 Chron. xxx. 1. Hezekiah orders a Paſſover.—xxxi. 2. He orders the courſes of Levites.—David, and Joſiah are alſo mentioned as inſtances[u].

Theſe

[s] I ſhould like to know, if it were poſſible, whether the Queen herſelf had any hand in tranſplanting her injunction into this Article. One can conceive, that her Majeſty's grammatical inaccuracy might remain uncorrected.

[t] Sparrow's Collection, page 82.

[u] Scotch Confeſſion. – Syntagma, page 156.

Theſe things are mentioned in the *Explanation*, leſt the precedents of the Old Teſtament ſhould not be now thought ſufficiently binding upon us Chriſtians, to make a part of our Proof.

The "*civil ſword*," &c. ſeems an alluſion to Rom. xiii. 4. "no juriſdiction,"—temporal or ſpiritual.

The words "*Chriſtian men*" occur both in the paragraph about capital puniſhments, and in that about war, which ſhews that our authorities are to come from the ſcriptures of the New Teſtament.—"*Wear weapons*," is the expreſſion, probably, of Anabaptiſts, and the Family of Love.

XII. Let us now go on to our *Proof*.

1. The King of our Realm, and not the Pope, is the Head of our Church.

2. The King is not a *Miniſter* of the church.

3. Chriſtians owe obedience to the Civil Magiſtrate.

4. Capital puniſhments are not always unlawful in a Chriſtian country.

5. It is not always unlawful for a Chriſtian to engage in war.

Though we have now had the *Hiſtory* relating to Property and Oaths, yet the lawfulneſs of them had beſt be proved under the ſubſequent Articles.

XIII. The King of our Realm, and not the Pope, is the Head of our Church. In the third Book the principles of *Alliance*[x] between Church and State, were briefly laid down and defended. There it appeared, that when a Church is compoſed of the ſubjects of a ſtate, there muſt be one Head of both, in order to effect unity of Government; and that it is much more uſeful to both that the King (or civil magiſtrate) ſhould preſide, under regulations ariſing from the nature of the Alliance,

[x] Book III. Chap. XIV. Sect. V.

Alliance, than the ſpiritual Head of the eccleſiaſtical ſociety. So far all lies within the nation.

As to any foreign ſpiritual power interfering, there ſeems no good foundation for it, either in the Law of Nature, or in the[y] Goſpel. And till the middle of the ſecond Century we are told, that all Chriſtian Churches were independent of each other, and[z] without any common Head.—But is not the Church *Univerſal?*—Chriſt did mean to form all his Diſciples into one Body, but never obliged a ſmall part of his Diſciples to continue in communion with a large body, contrary[a] to all the dictates of Reaſon and Conſcience. Each particular church, as has been frequently obſerved, ought to conſider itſelf as part of the Catholic Church; and treat the Members of all the other Churches as Brethren, from whom human weakneſs cauſes a preſent ſeparation. This is the moſt likely method of forming finally a ſolid union.

But if it were allowed, that the Catholic Church of Chriſt ought to have one viſible head, what pretenſions has the Biſhop of Rome to be that Head? none which can be conſidered as eſtabliſhed by general conſent. Rome was once a ſeat of Empire; if Chriſtian churches, in or near that Empire, had *then* occaſion to conſult together, ſome precedence would be proper and convenient, for the ſake of maintaining order, and unity of action;—reaſons of convenience, and analogy, might make a determination to fall, when a determination *muſt* be made, on the Biſhop of Rome.—But ſuch reaſons are now all *againſt* a Biſhop of Rome.

Beſides,

[y] Powell, page 355.

[z] See Art. XXI.—Bingham hath ſomething on the ſubject. Book 2. Chap. 4. & 6.

[a] Rev. xviii. 4—Art. XIX.

Beſides, if the whole Church of Chriſt is to have one head, would it not now be beſt to fix upon one in ſome other ſituation? America muſt now be conſidered, and the ſtate of Chriſtianity in Africa, and in Aſia: in the Eaſt Indies poſſibly Chriſtianity may make ſome progreſs; nay, would it not be right to have an Head of the Church, if one be neceſſary, in *different* places, at different times, according to the actual ſtate of the Chriſtian world? we muſt not for a moment ſuppoſe worldly *ambition* or intereſt to throw any difficulties in the way: certainly the Biſhop of Rome never was in the office, if ſuch an office there be, of head of the univerſal Church of Chriſt.

It may however be ſaid, that the Biſhop of Rome has exerciſed ſpiritual Power in *England.* He has; but it was one founded in no *right*, nor ever *ſubmitted* to, more than as the plundering of a robber is ſubmitted to whilſt his piſtol is at your breaſt. Whenever this nation has been free enough to be capable of making a contract, it has declared againſt papal uſurpations A contract ought always, in order to be valid, to promote the mutual benefit of the contracting parties; the ſpiritual power of Rome has been exerciſed merely for the benefit of Rome.

All Chriſtians ought, no doubt, to act for the good of Chriſtianity; but nothing would be more contrary to the general intereſts of Chriſtianity, than for the Pope to have authority over the Church of England:—we have left the Church of Rome from the fulleſt conviction of its errors and corruptions: in what way could the head of that Church now exerciſe authority over us, but in the way of controverſy and perſecution? we ſhould *reſiſt*, and the *event* muſt be, that Roman and Engliſh Churches would hurt each others religious principles materially.

No

No; if a *Courayer*, or if other learned and pious men, anxiouſly wiſh to have a Catholic church in *fact*, as well as in Theory, let them encourage general toleration, and quiet ſeparation of thoſe, who cannot conſcientiouſly hold communion together. Let the Biſhops of Rome give up all ambitious and lucrative projects, let the Romiſh Clergy enlighten their *people*, as much as they are themſelves enlightened:—this done, the Church of Rome is no longer an object of our jealouſy; we have no longer occaſion to be upon our guard. Intercourſe will generate confidence and mutual good opinion; theſe will generate benevolence; mutual benevolence is mutual attraction: attraction produces *Unity*. So that the firſt approach to Unity, is complete independence, and ſeparation.

Should ſuch unity prevail as to give a reaſonable proſpect of benefit from *Councils*, ſome *Precedence* may again be wanted. In that caſe let him preſide, who ſhall appear to be the beſt ſituated and qualified for preſiding. Our Iſland will ſcarcely aſpire to the honour. But whoever preſides, let him be aware of arrogance and oppreſſion!

I ſhould hope our firſt propoſition may now be conſidered as proved.

XIV. The King is not a *Miniſter* of the Church.

The reaſons given why the King ſhould be Head of the Church, his compulſive and protecting power, his ability to maintain the Miniſters, ſhew, that, in the Alliance of Church and State, there is no view of his having any employ that is not of a *temporal* nature. For prieſtly offices he is unqualified, and his time is occupied in others. Our reaſoning on this head in the third Book was general; and there is nothing in the Engliſh Church or State to be the ground of an exception:

But all parties being of one mind on this propoſition, an elaborate proof of it, is unneceſſary.

XV. Chriſtians owe obedience to the *Civil Magiſtrate*.

Here we quit the Biſhop of Rome, and come to thoſe *ſcruples* or prohibitions, the Hiſtory of which we have given collectively. Let us obſerve of them all together, that the error of them turns upon not diſtinguiſhing between what is *deſirable*, and what is *practicable*. However deſirable any end may be, if we adopt any impracticable meaſures, we only get farther from it; whereas if we begin with practical meaſures, we make ſome progreſs, however ſmall; and we may, by perſeverance, attain our end at laſt: to content ourſelves with what is practicable, is the moſt likely way to attain what is ultimately deſirable.

For proof that Chriſtians owe obedience to civil Magiſtrates, we may refer to Matt. xxii. 21.—Rom. xiii. 1—7.—Titus iii. 1.—1 Pet. ii. 13.—But the cogency of theſe proofs will be beſt underſtood by reading Biſhop *Sherlock's* Diſcourſe[b] on Rom. xiii. 1. which I would earneſtly recommend.

XVI. *Capital puniſhments* are not always unlawful in a Chriſtian country.—In the Goſpel it is taken for granted, not ordered, that an offender may be puniſhed with death.—Acts xxv. 11.—Rom. xiii. 4.

The *Jewiſh* capital puniſhments prove, that ſuch puniſhments are not ſo eſſentially wrong, as never to be right in any caſe. And nothing of the Jewiſh Law, relating to puniſhment, is repealed under the Goſpel.

XVII. *War* is not always unlawful to Chriſtians.

Here again we ſay, In the Goſpel, war is not ordered, but taken for granted.—See Matt. viii. 9. Luke

[b] Biſhop Sherlock's Diſcourſes, Vol. 4. Diſc. xiii.

Luke iii. 14.—Acts x. 1, 2.—2 Tim. ii. 4. Each of which texts ſhould be conſidered with this queſtion, what *would have been ſaid*, had war been univerſally to be prohibited?—Would not our Saviour, or St. John[c] Baptiſt, have thrown in ſome exhortations to *quit* the military profeſſion?

Under the *Old Law* we find many wars; and the Pſalmiſt bleſſes God for teaching[d] his hands to war, and his fingers to fight. To which no blame is annexed in the Goſpel[e].

XVIII. We have given a direct proof of our propoſitions, but ſome indirect ſeems wanting; eſpecially for the two[f] laſt.

It may be aſked, in the firſt place, are not capital puniſhments inconſiſtent with the benevolent ſpirit of the Goſpel? I would anſwer, firſt, that every right puniſhment is a ſpecies of benevolence: and is inflicted ſimply with a deſire of doing good. A man by puniſhing may ſometimes do more good than by forgiving.

But "*thou ſhalt not kill:*"—I would here borrow the words of St. Paul; "it is manifeſt that he is

[c] I was glad to find Auguſtin putting a ſpeech into the mouth of John Baptiſt, in the way here mentioned.—Contra Fauſtum, 22. 74. quoted in Sect. v.

[d] Pſalm cxliv. 1.

[e] Would Chriſt have been called the *Captain* of our Salvation if all military offices had been held in utter abomination?

[f] The Papiſts are apt to urge, that the Pope has a right to Supremacy, as ſucceſſor of St. *Peter*. The claim ſeems to me ſo weak, that I am unwilling to detain you upon it. Limborch, in his Syſtem of Theology, (L. 7. c. 9 & 10,) enters into the ſubject.—And Macknight takes notice, (Sect. 70. end; on Matt. xvi. 17—23.) of the worldly turn of St. Peter's mind, at the time when he is ſaid to have received his Commiſſion.—Limborch ſhews, both that St. Peter was not the *Head* of the Diſciples, ſo as to have any authority over them, and that the Biſhop of Rome was not ſucceſſor to St. Peter.—See alſo J. Hales's Tracts, page 251.

is excepted" who does not commit *murder*; and the Jewiſh *practice* (for this was part of the Jewiſh Law), makes this ſtill more evident.—This is a ſhort command, but if it were as long as a modern Act of Parliament, it would ſtill be liable to limitations taken from its true intent and meaning. For inſtance, if a man attacks my life, I am ſurely to prevent him from taking it, though by taking his;—one life muſt be loſt either way:—and if he attacks my property, I may *defend* that, otherwiſe my right is nothing: and if I cannot defend it but by taking his life, then I ſhould ſay, he deſtroys *himſelf*; 'tis the ſame thing as if I hold out my ſword, and he runs upon it.

A *Nation*, however, you will ſay, is ſafe, they may *ſecure* the offender, and therefore need not *kill* him. This may not be practicable in all caſes: ſuppoſe, in any caſe, it is; yet, in ſtrictneſs, what right has the criminal to force the community to maintain and watch him? if they are not obliged to maintain and watch him, then they have a right to defend themſelves againſt ſuch attacks as he may be expected to make if they do not maintain and watch him.—Yet it muſt be owned, that, though ſome may perhaps, even by man, be given over to a[z] reprobate mind, it is a rational exerciſe of *mercy* and benevolence, to ſecure others, even ſuch as had no ſtrict right to be ſpared.—The poſſibility of repentance is worth attending to: Reformation would be ſo great a good, that a light evil might be born for the chance of it.

But we are only concerned with *Scripture*.—Scripture might not reveal moral philoſophy ſupernaturally, any more than natural philoſophy. A time may come when capital puniſhments may be

[z] Rom. i. 28.

be ſpared; and yet they might not be *forbidden*[h] *in Scripture*; which is all our concern.

XIX. In the next place it may be aſked, with regard to *war*, is it not contrary to Matt. v. 38—41[i].?—Biſhop Burnet ſays, this is "a very great difficulty."—Suppoſe there was a ſenſe in which this paſſage prohibited *all* war, (as it certainly does all *forwardneſs* in going to war); that ſenſe could not be right, becauſe one part of ſcripture is to be interpreted ſo as to be *conſiſtent* with other parts.

The Sermon on the Mount is to be interpreted as being in ſome meaſure the language of *reproof*; the language of reproof is a part of *Eloquence:* what is intended to mortify and correct ſelf-ſufficiency, is not to be interpreted exactly in the ſame manner as what is delivered to the ingenuous and modeſt enquirer. In what our Saviour delivers, each Chriſtian precept is contraſted to ſome fault prevailing amongſt the reputable part of the Jews: ſo that one ſhould keep the ſelf-ſufficiency and the malevolence of ſuch Jews, continually before one's eyes: the Jewiſh character ſeems to have been malevolent, the Chriſtian benevolent.—The Chriſtian precept now in queſtion, is oppoſed to the practice of *Retaliation:* to malevolent rancour, flying inſtantly, on the receipt of an imagined injury, to ſeize eye for eye and tooth for tooth.—This muſt not be *Chriſtian* conduct, ſays our Saviour; it is not *right* conduct, nay, it was

[h] I think I ſaid here, in giving this Lecture, that ſome nations might be ſo barbarous, or ſo circumſtanced, after the publication of the Goſpel, that rights could not be ſafe, if no criminals were put to death: and therefore, that ſcripture could not well prohibit generally capital puniſhments, whatever it might have done if publiſhed in times very much improved.

[i] Barclay's Apology, Prop. 15.

was never *intended* to be Jewiſh.—But why is it not *right?* becauſe it is not the moſt effectual way to baniſh all injuries from the world, and to perfect human happineſs:—it is a natural movement, on the receipt of an injury, to fly to revenge; but this muſt be *checked*: it ſhould be a *Rule*, to *yield*, to bear, to give way a little, as we do to a bodily *ſtroke*, when it would otherwiſe be painful: great good would ariſe from the practice of this rule; we ſhould find the imagined injury no real one; or we ſhould ſoften the offender, or we ſhould bind to us by ties of gratitude, one of an haſty but generous temper. It is not, however, to be underſtood, that this rule is invariable, or univerſal, any more than another; when puniſhment will clearly anſwer a better end, and can be inflicted in the genuine ſpirit of *benevolence*, it muſt be applied; elſe there is a voluntary neglect of the *greater good*. But, *commonly*, men want much more perſuading to yield, than to puniſh. The miſtake with which we are now concerned, is this; if a *Rule* is given, it is taken as an only, or *ſingle* Rule; whereas, though each rule is *given* ſingly, it is not meant to exclude other Rules. One rule is, to let our light ſhine before men; another, not to let our left hand know what our right doeth; both excellent Rules! on different[k] occaſions: but neither of them can be followed ſingly, on all occaſions. Theſe limit each other; but every rule, if not limited expreſsly, is to be underſtood to be ſo tacitly, by conſiderations of the greateſt good. The very next words to our difficult paſſage, are, "Give to him that aſketh thee; and from him that

[k] Matt. xii. 37. makes our final ſentence to depend upon our *words*. Rom. ii 6, &c. on our *actions*.—I need ſcarce ſay, that reference is here made to Matt. v. 16. and vi. 3.

that would borrow of thee, turn not thou away." —Another excellent Rule, in its *place*:—no one has ever followed this without limitation; and yet it would be difficult to assign any reason why it is more variable, or liable to limitations, than that which immediately precedes it.

This may suffice to solve our difficulty; but I cannot quit it without observing, how irksome it is to be obliged to urge anything, which can have any tendency to lessen the force of that divine rule, yield to evil, "give place unto wrath;"—a rule dictated by that wisdom, which is from above, delivered from the mouth of him who knew what was in man: a rule so much wanted, and so replete with good, that one would not soon find one's self weary of expatiating on its complicated[1] benefits to mankind.

This is all the indirect proof I will give.—Any one might consult Grotius de Jure, &c. 1, 2. 6, &c.

xx. If any *application* were wanted, we might observe, with a view to *mutual concession*, that *war* is generally, or always, owing to some defect in Wisdom or in Virtue; to mistaking rights, to ambitious restlessness: though we cannot own, as a consequence, that no Nation can lawfully *defend* itself. To give up self-defence is impracticable. —I have wished to impress the distinction between what is desirable, and what is *practicable*: and therefore I will conclude with the following incident: we are told, that the *Pensylvanians*, after high professions of suffering anything rather than fight, determined to retake by force, a sloop from a Pirate.

The

[1] Reference is here made to John ii. 25.—Rom. xii. 19. and James iii. 17.

The excuſe they made was[m], that they did it as *Magiſtrates*, not as *Quakers*. The account is taken from a printed Book of *Trials*; of George *Keith*, and others.

[m] Leſlie's *Snake in the Graſs*, Sect. 18.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXXVIII.

OF CHRISTIAN MEN'S GOODS, WHICH ARE NOT COMMON.

THE Riches and Goods of Chriſtians are not common, as touching the right, title, and poſſeſſion of the ſame, as certain Anabaptiſts do falſly boaſt. Notwithſtanding, every man ought, of ſuch things as he poſſeſſeth, liberally to give alms to the poor, according to his ability.

I. Having taken the *Hiſtory* of this Article into the Hiſtory of the preceding, we may begin with *Explanation.*

II. The *Title* is in the ſame *form* with thoſe of the twenty-ſixth and twenty-ninth, on which we have had ſome remarks.

The *Latin* title ſeems obſcure; De illicitâ bonorum communicatione; may it be tranſlated, Of the unlawfulneſs of acting as if all goods were common?—that ſeems likely to be the *meaning.*

"Chriſtians,"—this word ſhews, as before, that our concern is only with the *Scriptures* of the New Teſtament, the true meaning of which we ſuppoſe ſome of our Chriſtian Brethren to have miſtaken.

Our Article conſiſts of two ſentences; the firſt of which expreſſes rights and duties of *perfect* obligation; the ſecond, thoſe of *imperfect* obligation.—At firſt ſight it ſeems odd to inſert in an Article,

Article, a duty, of the practice of which the Agent is to be the ſole judge; ſuch a duty ſeems only matter of exhortation: yet we have had ſimilar inſtances in the thirty-ſecond and thirty-fourth Articles. And where the miſtake of our brethren, who differ from us, depends very much upon taking indeterminate duties of Scripture for determinate, there it is immediately neceſſary to mark out the difference. But it is proper alſo to do it, when a ſtrict duty of perfect obligation would ſeem harſh, and contrary to Chriſtian benevolence, if its defects were not ſupplied by a free voluntary duty. In Article XXXII. it ſeemed proper to ſet marriage in an honourable light, by obſerving, that to ſome perſons it might be the ſtate productive of the greateſt virtue: ſo here, it ſeems proper to ſet ſtrict Juſtice in an honourable light, by ſhewing, that it is the ground of all that voluntary Benevolence, which is contraſted with it, and which cannot be reduced to determinate rules without more harm than good.—The inſtitution of property thus appears in its true light, and is ſeen as greatly beneficial to mankind.

III. I ſee nothing more for explanation.

And for *Proof*, I ſee but one propoſition.

'The inſtitution of *Property* is not contrary to the Goſpel.'

For as to *beneficence*, that is not mentioned as a matter in diſpute, but only as completing the idea of moral and Chriſtian duty, with regard to property; and as ſhewing property to be uſeful.

The direct proofs of our propoſition, to be found in Scripture, are very numerous: I will only aim at mentioning a number which may be ſufficient.—In Matt. v. 42. *giving* and *lending*, both imply property: ſo in Matt. vi. 3. do *alms*.—Thoſe of whoſe miſtake we are now treating,

ground

ground their notions very much on our Saviour's Sermon on the Mount.—From John xix. 27. it appears, that St. John had an home, which afforded a reſidence to the bleſſed Virgin Mary.—We may read alſo Rom. xii. 13. as marking, (like the texts from St. Matthew,) both the duties mentioned in our Article, determinate and indeterminate.—2 Cor. viii. anſwers the ſame purpoſe, and ſhews (ver. 13.) that Chriſtians had in St. Paul's time, unequal ſhares of property. Eph. iv. 28. forbids *ſtealing*, and adviſes induſtry for the purpoſe of raiſing a fund for beneficence —1 Tim. v. 8. ſhews an uſe of property prior even to beneficence itſelf. 1 Tim. vi. 17. preſuppoſes not only property, but even riches. James iv. 13. preſuppoſes traffick, or *Commerce*.—And particular perſons who were poſſeſſed of property, are ſpoken of with commendation: Cornelius, Philemon, Gaius. Not to mention Zachæus[a], or Joſeph of Arimathea.

IV. This direct proof muſt be ſurely ſufficient; but the *indirect* ſeems to require the greater attention on the preſent Article.—Yet it may be here obſerved of every text which is brought againſt the inſtitution of property, that no ſenſe of it can be admitted, which is not conſiſtent[b] with ſome ſenſe of the texts already quoted. I imagine we need not examine, as ſeeming to favour our adverſaries, more paſſages of Scripture than Matt. vi. 19.—Matt. xix. 16, &c. about the wealthy young man to whom Chriſt propoſed ſelling all he had.—Luke xvi. 19, &c. about the rich man and Lazarus.—Acts ii. 44, 45. about the firſt Chriſtians having all things in common; and 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10.

[a] Luke xix. 2, &c.

[b] As before, Art. XXXVII. Sect. XIX.

9, 10. or ſome paſſage of like import, expreſſing the miſchiefs attending riches.

v. Matt. vi. 19. is only a *comparative* expreſſion, though it has, no doubt, been ſometimes underſtood abſolutely. Its meaning only is, that men ought to *prefer* heavenly treaſures to earthly. We have had inſtances of this *negative* mode of compariſon[c] before.

vi. With regard to Matt. xix. 16, &c. the propoſal made by Chriſt to the wealthy young man, is certainly one intended for extraordinary emergencies. It cannot be made a ground of action in *ordinary* life, without the kind of proportion mentioned in the eleventh Chapter of the firſt Book. If the rich young man was, in *his* circumſtances, to act in ſuch a manner, how am I to act in *my* circumſtances?

This might ſuffice; but even take the tranſaction as it was in our Saviour's time, and it is no annulling of the inſtitution of property. A very great act of beneficence is held forth, or propoſed, on a very great occaſion; ſuch as might be propoſed on ſome few other great occaſions; ſuch as the captivity of a parent, an invaſion of one's country, a ſtruggle for civil liberty, &c. but I ſee no hint of any diſapprobation of the inſtitution of *Property*.—It does not appear that the refuſal was blamed; it does not appear to *me*, that the donation would have been *accepted*.

This might ſuffice as an anſwer to our objection, but it may be uſeful to reflect a little more on a caſe which has had very important[d] effects.

When the young man began to confer with our Lord, no one preſent had any idea of riches; nor indeed

[c] Objections to Art. XXVII.

[d] Aug. ad Hilarium.—Wall, page 183, quarto.

indeed till the very end of the conference; and then the mention of them was incidental. A worthy and amiable youth, of a wealthy family, had an ambition, turned, as I hope many others have, towards religious *perfection:* he ſeems to have been perſuaded, that he had *pretty nearly* attained his end. Jeſus having become known and celebrated, this young man comes to *confer* with him. He hopes to be told, that he is very *near perfection:* "what lack I yet?"—"Jeſus beholding him, *loved* him." He loved this worthy youth how *ſanguine* ſoever he might be; and loved him too well to flatter him. Perfection? alas! *man* has not attained to that; it may be an object of *purſuit*, a mark to look forward to; but that man is very imperfect[e] indeed, who thinks he has already attained perfection: "what *lack* I yet?" you ſay; ſee here *my diſciples*; is there nothing for you to aim at? what think you of becoming one of them? we have a religion to publiſh, which will be as great a bleſſing to mankind as they chuſe to let it be: the religion of the *Meſſiah*. Is there now nothing to do for one who aims at religious perfection?—He who publiſhes this religion muſt be my diſciple: and I have not where to lay my head! he muſt call the *poor* his brethren: he himſelf muſt be poor in ſpirit:—you are alarmed; and well you may; for being my diſciple might be the ruin of your fortune; nay, it might coſt you more than fortune; you might have to take up your Croſs, if you followed me.—The young man's ſanguine hopes are all blaſted. He had been flattered into an expectation of better things: he retires, mortified, and dejected.—Our Lord, without blaming him, takes occaſion to obſerve, that the rich will with difficulty (δυσκολως) be made uſeful in ſpreading his

[e] See Phil. iii. 12.

his religion: though there is no natural impoſſibility of their becoming converts, it is not to be *expected*. On ſome accounts the poor[f] will be more eligible, at firſt; yet whoever does ſacrifice worldly advantages for the ſake of Chriſtianity, ſhall be amply rewarded.

This is the *idea* which the paſſage conveys to *me*. Yet it is not to be expected that we ſhould ſee all the reaſons which our Saviour had for any meaſure that he took[g]. And it is poſſible he might, on many occaſions, eſpecially at firſt, avoid a language perfectly clear and explicit; and intend only to ſet men on thinking for themſelves. I can conceive it poſſible, that he had no thoughts of engaging the young man to be his diſciple: why ſhould he have a *youth* to follow him? why ſhould he incur the ſcandal of inveigling pious young men of fortune from their parents?

As to the expreſſions, "*go* and ſell that thou haſt"—"*come* and follow me"—they ſeem to amount to no more than a *propoſal*; they make that propoſal in a clear and lively way; but only to the purpoſe which we have mentioned.—We may conſider the caſe of this young man as an inſtance of what is delivered Luke xiv. 26—33; and that paſſage as illuſtrating this.—On the whole, the account of the rich young man, ſhews no *abſolute* perfection in parting with one's fortune: great occaſions may happen, when we may be called upon to make great ſacrifices. Ordinarily, perfection may be plain *frugality*.

VII. The parable of the rich man and *Lazarus*, Luke xvi. 19, &c. is calculated to have a very good effect in producing a right *uſe* of riches, but does

[f] 1 Cor. i. 26. 28 —James ii. 5.

[g] Art. XIV. this caſe was mentioned; Sect. IV. in the way of objection; to which the anſwer was given, Sect. V.

does not ſeem to have been intended to terrify men out of the poſſeſſion of them.—It repreſents two extremes in human life, ſplendor and indigence: death intervenes, and then there is a reverſe; he who had been high in this world, is in a ſtate of torment; he who had been low and wretched, is in a ſtate of bliſs: the rich man intreats him who had been poor, to adminiſter ſome relief; but all intercourſe is cut off.

It is not to be inferred that *every* rich man muſt be in ſuch a ſtate of inferiority to him on whom he had looked down in this world; but only that he *may* be; that is, if he be wicked, and the poor virtuous and good.—How little do the generality of rich men attend to what ſo plainly follows from the belief of a future ſtate of rewards and puniſhments! How do they ſuffer imagination and habit to repreſent to them the ſcenes of this life as continued into another!

That repreſentation, then, which will awaken men from ſuch dreams of prejudice, wants nothing more to make it of the utmoſt importance. It prompts every rich man to ſay, of every poor wretch with whom he has had any intercourſe; 'great and luxurious as I am, and mean and deſtitute as this miſerable creature is, it may happen, through my folly and his goodneſs, that he may be exalted to rejoice in the ſociety of Angels, whilſt I am abaſed to undergo the torments of Hell, and the taunts and inſults of Devils; nay, I may one day be glad to be a ſuppliant for relief and aſſiſtance, to him, who now intreats my help in vain.'

This being the thing particularly wanted, we may allow it to be the thing particularly meant.—And therefore we need not trouble ourſelves to inveſtigate what the crime of the rich man was: he

he was condemned, *therefore* he had been wicked; the poor man was rewarded, therefore he had been good: though certainly a rich man *may* be good, and a poor man wicked.—That the good in every ſtation, will be happy, and the bad miſerable, is proved in all parts of ſcripture: ſo that when we are told, that a man is happy after death, we may take his goodneſs for granted; as we may the wickedneſs of the damned.—The *end* of the parable then was, to *impreſs* upon the minds of the rich, that thoſe whom they now deſpiſed, or oppreſſed, *might* hereafter, whilſt they were caſt down beneath all earthly meanneſs, be ſoaring far above all earthly grandeur.—Suppoſe a rich man, by meditation on this parable, to acquire an *habit* of feeling this, and of repreſenting it to himſelf whenever he has any buſineſs or converſation with any poor perſon; though it need not make him throw his wealth into the ſea; yet what an heavenly diſpoſition it muſt generate in him! what mildneſs and humility! what condeſcenſion, humanity, and even *reſpect* for the poor and needy!

VIII. Much has been ſaid of Acts ii. 44, 45. (and iv. 32. 34.) but it does not appear to me, that *property* amongſt Chriſtians was ever aboliſhed. They were called upon, by the exigencies of the times, to offer large contributions for the ſupport of the poorer converts; ſo large, that they were obliged to *ſell* ſome poſſeſſions in order to make them. But all was *voluntary beneficence*. Indeed *after* the ſales were made, and the produce thrown into a common ſtock, that ſtock was poſſeſſed by Chriſtians in common. And popularly ſpeaking, *before* ſuch ſales, the generoſity of the richer converts was ſo great, that all might be ſaid to be welcome to every thing that any poſſeſſed. But

the

the expoſtulation in Acts v. 4. clearly implies the continuance of *property*; and Acts ii. 46. ſhews, that Diſciples kept their *houſes*.—Nay, if Chriſtians had, ſtrictly ſpeaking, given up their property at firſt, we could only infer any rule for ourſelves by that proportion, or compariſon of circumſtances, of which we juſt now ſpoke. —*Lucian* mentions Chriſtians as having things in common, and in the ſame popular ſenſe, in which I underſtand the two paſſages in the Acts of the Apoſtles[h].

IX. Such paſſages as 1 Tim. vi. 9, 10. only expreſs *facts*, not any general *doctrine*, or Theory. —Many evils, no doubt, ariſe from the abuſe of riches; and the deſcription of an abuſe is ſometimes apt to make well-meaning men ſo eager to avoid it, that they go much farther than was intended. Breaking a bad habit requires ſometimes, at firſt, almoſt as much reſolution as parting with a *Limb*; and therefore the Scripture tells us, we muſt be ready to part with a limb if it *offend* us, or be the occaſion of our ſinning:—but advice to correct an *abuſe*, is not to be miſtaken for advice to throw away the *uſe* of anything[i]; we are adviſed to reform the abuſe of anything in order that we may afterwards have all the advantages from it, which it is capable of producing. Spiritual power has been abuſed by the Biſhops of Rome; that is a good reaſon for a reform, but not for laying aſide all Ordinations.

Here we cloſe our proof, direct, and indirect.

X. An

[h] See Lardner's Works, Vol. 8. page 71, bottom; or Lucian's *Peregrinus*.

[i] See Matt. v. 29, 30.—Origen's mutilation was remedying an abuſe by taking away the uſe; and that by parting with a Limb. Matt. xix. 12.

x. An *Application* might lead us to conſider the rules of voluntary beneficence; and to inquire, whether any reſtraints might be laid on the accumulation of property?—But theſe things not being our immediate concern, I forbear to enter upon them.

ARTICLE

ARTICLE XXXIX.

OF A CHRISTIAN MAN'S OATH.

AS we confeſs, that vain and raſh Swearing is forbidden Chriſtian men by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and James his Apoſtle; ſo we judge, that Chriſtian Religion doth not prohibit, but that a man may ſwear when the Magiſtrate requireth, in a cauſe of faith and charity, ſo it be done according to the Prophet's teaching, in juſtice, judgement, and truth.

I. The *Hiſtory* of this as well as of the foregoing Article having been given under the thirty-ſeventh, we immediately look whether we have anything before us, which requires *Explanation.*

II. "*Vain* and *raſh* ſwearing," is oppoſed to that which is *important*, and *deliberate*, or done upon principle: it ariſes from habit, and is introduced for no good purpoſe; it muſt have ſome motives, but they are ſome kind of wrong ſentiments; often parts and kinds of vanity.

"Forbidden *Chriſtian* men," here again our concern is only with Chriſtian *Scripture:* the paſſages referred to, when Chriſt and St. James are mentioned, are Matt. v. 34, &c. and James v. 12.

"*We judge*"—cenſemus—this is not dogmatical.

"Doth not *prohibit*"—ſuppoſe a man thought, that Scripture *diſcouraged* ſwearing, even in evidence,

and that it was moſt *ſafe* to avoid it; ſtill he might allow, that Scripture did not *prohibit* it.

"When a *Magiſtrate* requireth,"—this is oppoſed to the vain and raſh ſwearing;—therefore, though a man might uſe vain and raſh ſwearing before a Magiſtrate, yet that is not the thing meant here. The vain and raſh ſwearing here meant, the Magiſtrate is ſuppoſed to have no concern with; it is ſuppoſed to be in private life.

"In a cauſe of *faith* and *charity*," in causâ *fidei* et *charitatis*;—that is, from motives of aſcertaining the *truth*, that Juſtice may be done; and of doing *good*.—*Fidem facere* is to create *confidence*, or make one's ſelf *believed*:—*cauſa* ſeems to be uſed by Cicero where we ſhould now uſe the word *caſe*;—in a cauſe of faith and charity, may therefore mean, in a *caſe* which requires *credit* to be eſtabliſhed for the ſake of knowing the real ſtate of it, as a ſtep to doing Juſtice: or in a caſe, in which, by taking an oath, you may do an act of *charity* or *benevolence*.—Dr. Ogden ſeems to have had our expreſſion in his mind, when he uſes the expreſſions, "in cauſes of importance, for the ſake of Truth, in ſupport of Juſtice, at the call[a] of Charity;"—*Luther*[b] ſays, we may ſwear if commanded by the Magiſtrate, or if not commanded, yet from motives of *charity*, as we may do other things not quite regular:—But in our Article, ſeemingly, both in the cauſe of Faith and the cauſe of charity, the Magiſtrate commands our evidence.—If ſo, it may be ſaid, we cannot make ourſelves perfect judges what kind of cauſe or caſe it is. It ſeems as if we could not; but an Article is not for *practice*; it

[a] Fifth Sermon on the Commandments, Vol. 2. page 63. 12mo.

[b] Works, Vol. 7. Enarrations on the Sermon on the Mount.—On Matt. v. 34. or thereabouts.

it only lays down what is *right:* every man muſt avoid oaths, in caſes not of faith and charity, as much as he can[c].—The concluding part of our Article does alſo point out what is right; adopting the words of the Prophet *Jeremiah*[d]; which ſeem alſo to be uſed in other places; and to denote ſwearing honeſtly and ſincerely.

III. We will now come to *Proof.*

'Solemn oaths, taken in obedience to authority, and from benevolent motives, are not forbidden by the Goſpel.'

Firſt we will take ſome direct proofs of this propoſition.

Under the *old Law*, ſwearing by Jehovah was conſidered as a mode of profeſſing to ſerve him; in preference to *Idols.* As *Goliah* curſed David by his Gods, ſo a Jew ſwore by Jehovah. In this light we are to ſee Deut. vi. 13.—Pſalm lxiii. 11. —Did this idea want confirming, any one might conſult Iſaiah lxv. 16. And the paſſages referred to in the margin of that text, which is introduced into our Article.

In the *New Teſtament*, we may look at Matt. xxvi. 63. obſerving, that whatever was ſaid in anſwer to *adjuration*, was ſaid upon Oath. And we ſhould read Mark viii. 12. for the ſake of the ει, (in Engliſh *verily*) which is ſometimes a particle of ſwearing, anſwering[e] to אם in Hebrew.—The Helvetic Confeſſion ſays, "Chriſtus et Apoſtoli[f] jurarunt;

[c] After all, the expreſſion, "*in a cauſe of faith and charity,*" may allude to ſomething which I have not ſeen. Or it may be taken from Luther, and made leſs clear by alteration. Luther gives, to my mind, a more diſtinct conception than our Article. But Dr. Ogden is perfectly clear.

[d] Jer. iv. 2.

[e] See Parkhurſt's Greek Lexicon under Ει. *Si* je l'aime! is not an *oath*; but a pretty powerful exclamation. Diderot.

[f] Confeſſ. Helvet. ad finem.

runt;" the inſtances of Chriſt we have juſt mentioned: St. Paul ſeveral times uſes expreſſions, which may with propriety be called Oaths. As in Rom. i. 9.—1 Cor. xv. 31. where the particle νη denotes an Oath.—2 Cor. i. 23. is too ſtrong to need any remark; and the ſame may be ſaid of 2 Cor. xi. 31.—Gal. i. 20. is very plain; as well as Phil. i. 8.—In the Epiſtle to the Hebrews the Deity is mentioned as ſwearing. Heb. iii. 11. (where ὠμοσα again occurs), and Heb. vi. 16, 17.

IV. But, as in the preceding Article ſo here, it is the *indirect* proof which requires the greateſt attention.—The *Quakers*[g] are very peremptory in objecting the two paſſages already mentioned, Matt. v. 33—37. and James v. 12. but they do not, that I perceive, uſe Matt. xxiii. 16—22. theſe *three* paſſages ſhould be in view together. And from them, taken together, I think the truth of our propoſition cannot be diſproved.

I do not perceive that the Quakers, or others, have made their ſuppoſed prohibition of ſolemn oaths *conſiſtent* with our direct proof: till they do that, they cannot be allowed to have the true ſenſe of Scripture.

The paſſages on which the objection is founded, have no relation to the acts of the *Magiſtrate*, as Luther obſerves: oaths taken in obedience to *authority*, are not affected by them. Neither do they prohibit ſwearing by the *Deity* himſelf: people may indeed ſwear in private by the Deity himſelf, profanely and blameably; but that was not, ſeemingly, a *cuſtom* amongſt thoſe who are reproved in the New Teſtament: indeed the reaſoning in both the paſſages of St. Matthew, ſhews, that it was carefully *avoided*; and on that avoiding, all *excuſes* were built.

All

[g] Barclay's Apology, Prop. 15. Sect. 10.

All the oaths ſpecified by Chriſt, were *vain* and *childiſh*, though connected with the Jewiſh *religion*; for the people who uſed them, were not, as in our days, diſſolute and licentious; but formal and preciſe. We have not, that I know of, any ſet of people amongſt us, who have the "*form*[h] *of Godlineſs*," and yet accuſtom themſelves to a ſet of *pious oaths*, excuſing themſelves by ſaying, that ſuch as they take, are *no* oaths. Yet this ſeems to have been the caſe amongſt the Jews; the very Scribes and Phariſees[i] ran into the moſt frivolous and unmeaning diſtinctions, between thoſe ſayings which were *real* oaths, and thoſe *like* ſayings which were *no* oaths. Now ſayings like oaths, yet accounted no oaths, would produce two faults; one, hypocritical profaneneſs, the other, deceit and fraud.—Matt. v. 33—37. ſeems to turn more upon the former, and Matt. xxiii. 16—22. more upon the latter.—If it ſhould be thought, that οφειλει, "he is a debtor," Matt. xxiii. 16. 18. means only, as oppoſed to ουδεν εστι, "it is nothing," to denote a *real* oath; ſtill the two faults, profaneneſs and falſhood, would, in fact, ariſe; and would both deſerve ſevere reprehenſion.

I remember to have heard very young and very ignorant people, uſe words like oaths, and then excuſe themſelves, by ſaying, that they had not ſworn; but grave, religious people have not, I think, amongſt us, any ſuch ſyſtem of hypocritical profaneneſs.—That our Saviour ſpoke of common *converſation*, appears from the word Λογος, ſermo, diſcourſe: and (Luther thinks) from the terms "yea, yea; nay, nay[k]."

We

[h] 2 Tim. iii. 5. [i] Matt. xxiii. 15, 16.

[k] April 21, 1792. The accounts given me this day, by a Captain in the Navy, of oaths in trials in the Admiralty-court, are curious. He ſays, that people of different Nations and Religions,

We can conceive, that it might be worthy of our Lord to check ſuch folly. It was profane and impious; and ſo had a tendency to debaſe and bring contempt upon religion: it muſt alſo greatly weaken and looſen mens principles of veracity.—But why might not the evil moſt immediately in view, be, its hurting the dignity and the obligation of *ſolemn oaths?* and ſo occaſioning perjury? at leaſt, ſtopping ſuch fooliſh oaths as the Jews made uſe of, is rather ſupporting ſolemn oaths, than diſcouraging them. And is perfectly conſiſtent with ſuch as St. Paul uſed.

v. With regard to St. *James*, he ſeems to have had the ſame view of the ſubject with our Saviour when on the Mount. He mentions *two* of the ſame frivolous oaths, but goes no farther: inſtead of going on, he ſays, as a kind of *et cetera*, "neither by *any other* oath;"—which muſt mean, any other *ſuch* oath; we cannot conceive his thoughts to leap from ſuch a train of trifling profaneneſs, to a ſolemn, devout, deliberate oath by the Supreme Deity himſelf.—"Let your yea be yea,"

Religions, will ſwear anything, and flatter themſelves they are not perjured, if only the *form* of taking the oath differs, in any thing, from that to which they have been accuſtomed. And methods are uſed, by thoſe belonging to the Court, to hit off their modes of ſwearing: one man, while a foreigner is taking an oath, will hold up one finger, another two fingers, a third preſents a Cruciſix; and ſo on; meaning to uſe that form, which the witneſs will deem binding.

The chief caſe in which theſe oaths are taken, ſeems to be, when enemy's property has been taken under neutral colours; then the neutral Captain ſwears the property to be neutral: there are always papers concealed ſomewhere, ſhewing the real caſe: and others, counterfeits, to produce to Captors. The real papers, had, in one caſe, been found, and the Captain, not knowing that, ſwore to the counterfeits: on the real papers being produced, he dropped down dead.—One could not hear ſuch an account, from reſpectable authority, without recollecting the death of *Ananias*.—Acts v. 5.

yea," has been underſtood to mean, 'ſpeak the *Truth*;' and therefore to *imply*, that the Jews had run into falſhood. He concludes with, "leſt ye fall into condemnation," ὑπο κρισιν[l].

Our Lord had marked the *origin* of ſuch folly, εκ τȣ πονηρȣ[m]; St. James points out the *conſequence*. But ſuch oaths as are deſcribed in our *Article*, would ſcarcely be ſaid to proceed from *evil*, at leaſt, in the ſpeaker: though, as before, oaths, in *general*, may imply, ſome preſumed imperfection in mens general *veracity*[n].

As the *Quakers* will allow of nothing but literal conſtruction, one might aſk them, in the way of argumentum ad hominem, how they underſtand[o] Matt. v. 40.

I will here cloſe my indirect proof, preſuming that objections to our propoſition are now removed.

VI. If we had *time*, I might make ſome *Application*, by offering a few remarks on *Perjury*, and on *profane ſwearing*, ſuch as ſhocks our ears in *modern* times; but this is at preſent impracticable:—perjury I have treated in a Syſtem of Morality; and profane ſwearing is attacked in a very maſterly manner, in Dr. Ogden's Sermons on the Commandments.

[l] For ὑπο κρισιν, the MSS. Steph. 1ſt. and Veleſ. read εις ὑποκρισιν, which Grotius adopts: how ſuch hypocritical oaths may make men fall into *hypocriſy*, is intelligible enough.

[m] The Firſt Bodleian MS. has εκ τȣ διαβολȣ.

[n] Art. XXXVII. Sect. III.

[o] P. S. When I appealed to this Text I believe I was not aware of Dr. Ogden's appeal to the ſame (Serm. v. on the Commandments, Vol. 2. page 57. duodecimo.)—He ſays, "It is written, *If any man will ſue thee at the Law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak alſo.*—Are they willing to deliver up their property always to the firſt invader? of theſe rights they are ſometimes, and with reaſon, a little more tenacious."

INDEX.

THIS Index is not intended to ſuperſede the uſe of the printed *Heads* of Lectures, which the Author imagines would be very ſerviceable in giving the Reader the true ſcope and purpoſe of each part of the work; but only to enable him to find what the printed Heads would not readily point out. The figures are meant to correſpond to the running title, placed at the top of each page, and therefore they mark *Book*, *Chapter*, and *Section*. In ſome few places a fourth number marks *Subſection*. And ſometimes when a Section is long, the *page* is mentioned.

In the fourth Book each *Article* of the Church of England is conſidered as a Chapter. The *Introductions* and *Appendixes* will be eaſily underſtood from the Heads of Lectures.

If reference is made, in the Index, to more Sections than one in the ſame Chapter, they are ſeparated only by *commas*. If to ſeveral in *ſucceſſion*, only the firſt and laſt are mentioned, and a line is put between them: as in the running Title.

Where the ſame ſubject occurs repeatedly, it is ſometimes mentioned both in the Index and Heads of Lectures.

Thus, III-XIII-1. means the third Book, the thirteenth Chapter, and the firſt Section.

IV-XVI-3. means the fourth Book, the ſixteenth *Article*, and the third Section.

III-X-15-4. means the third Book, tenth Chapter, fifteenth Section, and fourth Subſection.

III-XV-11, p. 192. means that Section 11. is ſo long, that it is worth while to note the *page*.

II-III-4, 5, 6. means the ſecond Book, third Chapter, and Sections fourth, fifth and ſixth.

II-IV-1—6. means ſecond Book, fourth Chapter, and the firſt ſix Sections.

I may here obſerve, that it ſeemed better to refer to texts of Scripture than to *quote* them; becauſe not quoting muſt make the work much ſhorter, and may engage the Reader's attention to the Context. Theſe reaſons extend to other paſſages, which might have been quoted, beſides thoſe of Scripture.

I beg permiſſion to mention, that whenever I have been induced to give any part of this work a *ſecond reading*, in what might be called one peruſal, I have ſeen its force and meaning more clearly than at firſt.—A conſequence, probably, of its having been written merely as a preparation for ſpeaking. Which has alſo occaſioned a word to be uſed here and there, not thoroughly adopted into the Engliſh Language.

A

ABBÉ Paris. I-XVI-10,14.
Abgarus. I-XII-5.
—XVII-6.
IV-XXII-4.
Absolution. IV-XVI-18.
—XXV-4.
Accommodation. I-XVII-19.
Accursed. III-IX-1.
IV-XVIII-8.
—XXXIII-3.
Acontius. IV-VII-4.
Acrimony in dispute.
I-XII-14.
II-II-14.
III-X-15-4.
Adam. I-XVI-8.
IV-IX introd. 16.
—IX-1, 2, 4, 6, 14, 15, 19, 21, 29.
—X-24, 37.
Addison. I-XVIII-19.
II-IV-13.
IV-XXXI-13.
Adults. IV-XXVII-14, (see Sponsors) 17.
Agape. IV-XXVIII-5, 21.
Agency, divine and human opposed. IV-IX introd. 1.
—X-41.
—XVII-9,79,98.
Agent. (see Minister.)
IV-XXII-17.
—XXV-4.
—XXVI-4, 6.
—XXXIII-11.
—XXXVI-18, 19.
Agriculture. II-IV-4.
IV-IX-44, 45.
Albigenses. IV-XXIII-3.
Alderman. IV-XXXVI-1, 12.
Allegorists. I-XVI-7.
I-XVII-19.
IV-IV-5.
and page 417.
IV-VI-3.
—VII-3.
—IX-4.
Allix. I-XVII-19.
I. App. 21.
IV-I-2, 6, 16.
—II-1.
—VI-3, 10, 11, 12.
—XXVIII-4.
Altar. IV-XXXI-1, 2, 4, 5, 6.
Ambrose. IV-VI-12.
—XXVIII-33.
America. III-V-1, 4.
IV-III-2.
—VIII-12.
—XXIII-7.
—XXV-4.
—XXXVII-13.
Anabaptists. IV-VII-3.
—IX-12.
—X-12.
—XI-11.
—XIII-5.
—XV-4.
—XVI-3.
—XXVI-2.
—XXVIII-11.
—XXXVII-6.
Anatomist. II-IV-7.
Angels. I. App. 8, 9, 18, 26.
IV-XXV-4.
Antilegomena. I-XII-4.
IV-VI-14.
Antinomians—see Crispe.
IV-VII-3.
—XV-6.
—XVI-9.

Apocrypha

Apocrypha. I-XII-2.
IV-VI-10,11, 34.
—XXXV-4.
Apollonius. I-XII-17.
Apology. IV-VIII-8, 12.
Aquinas. IV-XIII-4, 14.
—XVII-8, 71.
—XXII-2.
—XXIV-1.
Archontici. IV-XXV-2.
Argumentum ad Hominem.
I-XVII-19.
II-II-13, 14.
IV-IX-Introd. 16.
Aristides. I-XIV-4.
Aristophanes. II-IV-10.
Aristotle. II-III-15.
Arminius, and followers.
IV-X-15.
—XVI-8.
—XVII-4, 11, 12, 19, 20, 30.
Arthur, Prince. IV-VII-5.
Articles. III-I-1, 5, 6.
—V-1, &c.—also Chap. IX, &c.
IV-Introd. entire.
IV-XVII-20, 23, 24. (see Lambeth).
IV-XVIII-1, 7.
—XIX-1.
Ascodrutæ. IV-XXV-2.
—XXVII-28.
—XXVIII-2.
Asseman. IV-II-9.
Assembly of Divines.
IV-XVII-20, 23
—XXIII-12.
—XXXIII-6.
Association. III-III-6,8,10.
IV-XX-7.
—XXII-4,5,19.
—XXIII-22.
Assurance. IV-XVI-10, 25, 31, 37.
Athanasian Creed.
III-IV-4.
—IX-9.
IV-II-9.
—II-42.
—IV-4.
—VIII-8, &c.
Review of Sermon on it, IV-VIII-12. end.
Athanasius. IV-I-10 end.
—I-17, p. 271.
—II-21.
—VIII-2, 8.
—XVI-4.
—XXVI-3, 6.
Attrition. IV-XXV-4.
Augustin. I-I-6.
I. App. 4-10.
II-V-11.
III-X-15-end.
IV-I-1, 4, 6, 17.
—II-45.
—IX-5, 7, 9, 44.
—X-6, 20, 26.
—XIII-2.
—XIV-3.
—XVI-5, 10, 30.
—XVII-5, 28.
—XVIII-2.
—XXII-2, 4, 5, 18.
—XXIV-1.
—XXV-2.
—XXVI-1.
—XXVII-14.
—XXIX-2.
—XXXIII-3.
—XXXIV-5.
—XXXVI-4, 18.
—XXXVII-5, 17.

Authority. III-XIV-12.
IV-XXXVI-1.

B

Balguy, Mr. John.
IV-XI-App. 9.
Balguy, Dr. Thomas
I-XIX-11, 14.
II-V-1, 3.
III-IV-3, 4, 6, 9.
—V-2.
—VI-6.
—IX-6.
—X-14.
—XI-4, 6, 11.
—XIII-8.
—XIV-12, 13.
—XV-4, 9.
IV-Introd. 2, 3.
—II-42.
—VII-6, 13.
—VIII-11.
—IX-20, 32.
—XI-App. 9.
—XIII-1, 4, 17, 22, 24, 30.
—XV-23.
—XVII-20.
—XIX-19.
—XXIII-17, 22, 26.
—XXVIII-13, 20, 30.
—XXIX-5.
—XXXV-1.
Baptism. IV-I-18.
—IX-32.
—XIII-10.
—XVI-5, 19.
—XXIII-5, 14.
—XXV-2, 3, 5, 7, 8.
—XXVI-6.
—XXVII passim.
(see Heads.)
Baptism. IV-XXXIII-3.
—XXXIV-2, 7.
Baptist. IV-VIII-11, p. 110.
—XVII-22.
—XXV-3, 7.
—XXVII-15, 30, 35.
—XXVIII-12.
—XXXIII-7.
Baptistery. IV-XXVII-4.
Barbeyrac. IV-XII-14.
—XIV-5.
Barclay. I-XI-6.
see Quakers.
IV-XXVII-29.
—XXVIII-20.
—XXX-10.
—XXXIV-2.
—XXXVII-19.
Barnabas. IV-XI-App. 1.
Baxter. III-IV-1.
IV-X-4.
—XII-25.
—XIII-5.
—XIV-7.
—XV-23.
—XVI-5, 10, 15, 29, 30, 31.
—XXI-1.
—XXIII-4, 16, 25.
—XXXVI-4.
Belsham. I-XVI-8.
IV-XVII-21.
Bennet. IV Introd. 6.
—XX-1.
—XXV-2.
—XXVII-29.
—XXIX-1.
—XXXVI-5.
Bentley. I-IX-8.
IV-I-Append.
Berquin. II-IV-13.
Berriman, John. IV-II-37.
Beza. I-VII-5.
IV-XVII-15.

Bible, our present.
I-IX-II.
III-IX-I.
IV-III-6.
Bigotry. II-II-8.
III-XV-6.
Bilson, Bishop. III-IV-3.
Bingham. passim.
III-XI-10.
—XIII-1, 8.
IV-Introd. 3, 6.
—I-4. p. 232.
—IV-17.
—V-1.
—VI-16.
—XXIII-1.
—XXIV-2.
—XXV-4.
—XXVII-5, 15.
—XXVIII-5.
—XXXVI-passim.
Bishop. IV-XXXVI-1, 2, 3, 5, 11, 12, 13.
Blasphemy. IV-V-11.
—XVI-11, 34.
—XXXI-8, 10.
Blood. IV-XI-App. 2, 27.
IV-XXXIV-27.
Bæhmen, Jacob. III-XV-11. p. 188, &c.
Bona, Cardinal. III-XV-11, p. 192, &c.
IV-XXV-5.
—XXVI-3.
—XXXI-1, 4.
Boys, on the Articles.
IV-XIII-14.
Bradford. IV-XVII-17.
Bramhall, Archbishop.
III-XIII-1.
IV-XXIII-4, 12.
—XXV-2.
Brerewood. IV-XXIV-1.
—XXXII-10.
Brown, Dr. John.
II-III-10, 15.
—IV-14.
Brownists. IV-VII-6.
—XVI-3.
—XXIII-6.
Bullet. I-XIV-12.
I-XVI-10.
I-XVIII-11.
et passim.
Burges, Dr. John.
II-V-11.
III-VII-4.
IV-Introd. 6.
—XIX-1.
—XXXV-1.
—XXXVI-7.
Burn. IV-XVI-3.
—XXVII-15.
—XXXIII-8.
—XXXV-1.
—XXXVII-6, 10.
Burnet, Bishop.
III-IV-5.
—XII-1.
—XIII-8.
IV-Introd. 1, 2, 6.
—I-4, p. 230.
—I-18.
—I-App.
—II-1.
—III-1, 6.
—IV-7.
—VII-3, 5.
—XIII-14.
—XIV-4.
—XVII-10, 14.
—XVIII-2, 10.
—XIX-1.
—XXIV-2.
—XXVI-5.
—XXVIII-11, 20.
—XXX-1, 2.
—XXXIV-17.

Burnet,

Burnet, Bishop.
IV-XXXV-2.
—XXXVI-5.
—XXXVII-19.
Butler, Joseph, Bishop.
I-XII-1.
—XV-6.
—XVI-12.
—XIX-1, 15, 19.
IV-IX-34.
—XI-App. 9, 29.
p. 324.
—XVI-31.
—XVII-86.
Butler, Samuel. II-IV-13.

C

Cajetan, Cardinal.
IV-XIII-5.
—XXIV-1.
Called. IV-XVII-44.
—XXIII-15, 16.
—XXXVI-18.
Calmet. I-IX-6, 10.
—X-8.
IV-X-9.
Calvin, and followers. (see Predestination).
IV-Introd. 4.
—III-2.
—VII-4.
—IX-13.
—X-15, 20, 39.
—XVI-7, 8, 37.
—XVII-9, 11, 12, 15, 17, 18, 86.
—XIX-9.
—XXII-19.
—XXVI-11.
Campbell. I-IX-11.
IV-II-1.
Candid disquisitions.
IV-VIII-11, 12.
Candor. I-I-5.
—App. 30.
III-V-3.
Canonical. I-XII-2.
IV-VI-11, 14.
Carless. IV-XVII-17.
Catalogues. IV-VI-12, 19.
Catechism. (see Racovian, and Trent).
III-X-11.
IV-II-42.
—VII-7.
—XVII-20.
—XIX-11.
—XXV-4, 8.
—XXVIII-3.
Cathari. I-App. 4, 12.
IV-VI-2.
Catholicus consensus.
IV-XI-App. 2.
—XXIX-2.
Cave. IV-XXV-2, 4, 5, 7.
—XXVII-5.
Ceremonies. III-IV-2.
—XV-12.
IV-XX-1, 2, 7.
—XXV-3, 5, 10.
—XXVIII-4.
—XXXIII-4.
—XXXIV-2, 3, 14.
Cerinthus. I-App. 22, 25, 28.
IV-II-5, 15.
—IV-1.
Cervantes. II-IV-13.
Chambers. I-XV-22.
Chances, calculation of.
I-XVI-6.
Chandler, Bishop.
I-XVII-9, 15, 18, 19.
IV-VI-12.
Character, indelible.
IV-XXV-2, 3, 5, 6.

Charlemagne. IV-XIII-4.
—XXII-4.
—XXXV-1.
Charms. IV-XXV-7, 8.
—XXIX-1.
Chatham, Earl of.
IV-XVII-21.
Cheynel. IV-IV-App.
—VII-3.
—XXXVII-6.
Chillingworth. IV-VII-7.
Chivalry. IV-XIII-22.
Chosen. (see Elect).
Chrism. IV-XXV-3.
—XXVII-6.
Church. III-VII-4.
—XI-4.
IV-III-6.
—XVIII-7, 14.
—XIX-2, 4, 5, 7, 15, 17.
—XXI-1, 17.
—XXIII-13, 14, 17.
—XXX-4.
—XXXIV-19.
Church, attendance on.
II-IV-5, 7.
Church, eastern & western.
IV-V-3.
—VI-23.
—XXIV-1, 4.
—XXVII-10.
—XXXIV-5.
—XXXVII-2.
Cicero. I-XIV-5, 7.
—XIX-12, 19.
II-III-3, 12.
III-VII-2.
—X-2, 4.
IV-I-1.
—III-8.
—IX-3.
—X-2.
Cicero. IV-XVII-2.
—XXII-2, 6.
Circumcelliones.
IV-XXVI-1.
Circumstances, as helping interpretation.
I-X-1.
III-I-7.
—VII-5.
IV-Introd. 7.
—X-42.
Clarke. I-III-3.
—XIX-19.
IV-I-4, p. 226.
—I-8, 18.
—I-Appendix.
—III-6.
—VIII-11.
Cleaver, Bishop.
IV-XI, App. 27.
—XXVIII-1, 13, 20, 30, 33.
—XXXI-10.
Clemens Romanus.
IV-XXIII-2.
—XXXVI-3.
Clinical. IV-XXV-4, 12.
—XXVII-10.
Cole. II-III-4, 11.
—IV-11.
Colleges. III-VIII-2.
IV-XXIV-5.
Collins. I-XVII-10, 14.
IV-Introd. 6.
—VI-9.
Collyridians. IV.XXII-4.
Comber. IV-XXIV-1.
—XXV-4.
Commination. IV-VIII-11, p. 112.
Communion, for families.
IV-XXVIII-5.
for funerals.
—XXVIII-11.

Communion

Communion of Saints.
IV-VIII-4.
—XXII-6.
—XXV-4.
—XXXI-4.
Comprehension. III-XIV-15.
Concubinage. IV-XXV-6.
Concupiscence. IV-IX-2, 5, 12, 26, 32.
Confession. IV-XXV-4.
—XXXIII-5.
Confirmation. IV-XXV-3, 9.
Constantine. I-XVIII-15.
III-V-3.
IV-I-15.
—XVI-2.
—XXXIV-7.
Constitution. IV-IX-18, 28.
—XXXVI-1.
Consubstantiation.
IV-XXVIII-10.
Contrition. IV-XXV-4.
Conversion. IV-X-26, 50.
—XII-8.
—XVII-45.
Convocation. III-VII-4.
Cooke, Dr. William, Dean of Ely. I-XVII-10, (p. 239), 15, 20.
I-XIX-12.
Copts. I-V-7.
—IX-5.
III-X-8.
IV-XXIV-1.
Corpus Christi.
IV-XXVIII-10.
Corpus et Syntagma. (see Syntagma).
Councils, including Nicene; but see Trent.
IV-I-4.
—VIII-5.
—XXI-1, 2, 3, 4, 10.
Councils including Nicene; but see Trent.
IV-XXII-4.
—XXV-2, 3.
—XXX-1.
—XXXII-3, 4.
—XXXIII-3.
—XXXVII-2, 13.
Cranmer. I-XVIII-13.
IV-Introd. 4.
—XIII-5.
—XVII-16.
—XXVIII-11.
—XXX-6.
—XXXI-4.
—XXXII-12.
—XXXV-1, 4.
—XXXVII-2.
Crellius, Paul. IV-VII-3.
Crispe. IV-XI-10.
—XI, App. 9.
—XIII-5.
Criticism and taste.
I-XII-13.
Cromwell. IV-XVI-8.
Cupid and Psyche.
III-X-15.
Customs. IV-VI-5. (see Habits).
IV-XXXIV-2, 17, 24.
—XXXVI-1.
Cyrus. IV-XIII-17.

D

Dacier. IV-I-1, 3.
—IX-3, 5.
—X-2.
Daillé. I-XII-16.
IV-XXV-4.
D'Alembert. IV-X-13.
Damascene. IV-XXII-4, 5.

Deacon. IV-XXXVI-1-2, 3, 15, 17.
Deaconess. IV-XXV-5.
—XXXII-19.
Death. IV-IX-14, 29.
Deceased Christians. IV-XXII-6.
Defender of the Faith. III-IX-1.
IV-XXXVII-2.
Deformity. II-III-7.
Deluge. I-XVI-8. (see de Luc).
Demoniacs. I-XIII-10.
IV-IX-Introd. 16.
—XXV-5.
Dickinson. IV-XV-6.
Diderot. IV-XIII-22.
Digby, Lord. III-XIV-10.
—XV-6.
Dionysius. III-X-9.
IV-IV-5.
—VIII-6.
—XXXVII-2.
Diptychs. —XXXIII-4.
Directory. —XXV-3, 4, 6.
—XXVII-15.
—XXVIII-12.
Discipline. III-XV-12.
IV-XXXIII-1, 7.
—XXXVI-16.
Dissenter. III-IV-4, 5.
—XIV-2, 8, 15.
—XV-6.
IV-I-3, p. 224.
—I-15.
—II-43.
—VIII-11, page 109.
—XVI-3.
—XVII-21.
—XX-4, 7.
—XXIII-26.
Dissenter. IV-XXV-2.
—XXVI-6.
—XXVIII-12.
—XXXI-5.
—XXXIII-7.
(see Puritans and Presbyterians).
Dissertation on the 17th Article, Oxf. 1772.
III-IV-9.
—IX-1.
IV-Introd. 4.
—XVII-7, 9, 16, 29.
Divorce. IV-VII-13.
—XXV-2, 6.
—XXXVII-2.
Docetæ. I-App. 19, 20, 24.
IV-II-4, 15.
—VI-29.
—XI-App. 2.
Doctrina, &c. Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. IV-Introd. 4.
—II-3.
—VII-3.
Donatists. IV-VIII-4.
—XVI-2.
—XXV-2.
—XXVI-1.
Dort, Synod of. IV-X-15.
—XVII-11, 19.
Doxologies. IV-I-4.
—V-1.
Duelling. IV-XIII-22.
—XXXVII-3.

E

Eachard. II-IV-13.
Easter. IV-XXXIV-5.
—XXXVII-2.
Ebionites. IV-II-5.

Edwards, Jonathan.
II-v-10.
IV-x-19, 33.
—xi, App. 9.
—xii-25.
—xiii-5.
—xvi-8.
—xvii-22.
Election. IV-xvi-5, 20.
—xvii-5, 14, 30, 44, 69, 92.
—xix-12.
—xxiii-15. (see Chosen).
Enthusiasm. III-xv-11, p. 181.
IV-Introd. 3.
—x-19, 49.
—xvi-31, page 470.
—xvii-56.
—xxv-2.
—xxxvi-17.
Epictetus, including Carter.
IV-iii-4.
—xvii-89.
Epiphanius. IV-i-1.
—iv-17.
—iv-App.
Episcopius. IV-ii-42.
—x-15.
Erasmus. IV-Introd. 4.
—i-4.
—i-App.
—x-2.
—xvii-16.
—xviii-5.
Erastus. —xxxiii-6.
Evangelist. IV-xxiii-24.
Eucharist. —xxviii-4.
Euchitæ. IV-xxv-2.
Evil, referred to God.
IV-x-50.
—xvii-92, 93.
Evil, referred to God.
IV-xxv-10.
Excision. IV-xxxiii-2, 9.
Excommunication.
III-xiv-1.
IV-xxv-4.
—xxxiii, passim.
Execrations. IV-xxxiii-2, 3, 4.
Exorcism. (see Demoniacs).
IV-xxvii-4, 7.

F

Faith. IV-x-29.
—xi-2. and passim.
—xi-17.
—xii-12, 14, 25.
—xvi-3.
Fall. I-xvi-8. (see Adam).
IV-ix-19, 20.
—xvi-22.
Familists. IV-vii-3, 7.
—xv-5.
—xvii-18.
—xxiii-6.
—xxv-2.
—xxviii-11.
—xxxiv-17.
—xxxvii-10.
Fanaticism. III-xv-11, p. 181.
IV-vii-2.
—xxiii-6.
—xxvi-1.
Fate. IV-iv-4.
—ix-Introd. 8.
—x-9.
—xvii-2, 20, 25, 62.
Fenelon. I-xvii-14.
II-v-10, 11.
III-xv-11, p. 187, &c.
(see Maxims of the Saints).

Fielding. I-XIII-7.
II-III-4, 14.
—IV-14.
IV-XXXVII-3.
Filioque. IV-V-3.
Fisher, Bishop. IV-XXII-21.
Fitzjames, Duke of.
IV-IX-36.
Five points. IV-X-15, 26.
—XVII-5, 19.
Flesh. IV-XXXIII-13. (see Docetæ.)
Foote. II-III-1.
—IV-13.
—V-10.
Forbes. passim.
IV-I-4, p. 228.
—X-5.
—XXII-passim; partic. Sect. 6.
—XXV-2.
—XXVI-2.
Fox, John. IV-Introd. 4.
—VII-2.
—XXV-2.
—XXVIII-26.
—XXXII-6, 12.
Fulke. IV-XVI-3, 8, 10.
—XVII-9, 29.
—XXII-2, 6.
—XXIV-1.
—XXV-2, 7.
—XXVIII-11.
—XXIX-1.
—XXX-4.
—XXXI-2, 12.
—XXXII-17.
—XXXIII-3.
Fuller. IV-Introd. 4.
—VII-3, 5.
Fulness of time.
I-XVI-7, p. 191.
—XIX-18.
Fur prædestinatus. IV-XV-12.
Fur prædestinatus.
IV-XVI-8.
—XVII-15.

G

Galileo. II-V-11.
Geneva. (see Switzerland).
Genlis. II-IV-13.
Gerizim. I-V-4.
Gibbon. IV-I-1, 3, 4, 6, 17, end.
—I-App.
—VIII-8.
Gibson, Bishop.
I-XVII-18.
I-XIX-1, 7, 9.
III-XIV-15.
—XV-11. p. 183, 195.
IV-VI-22, 26.
—IX-3.
—X-39.
—XXXVII-2.
Gift of God. IV-XVI-30-5.
—XVII-83, p. 32.
—XXXII-18.
God, his Nature how conceived. I-III-1, 3.
IV-I-10, p. 247.
Golden Age. IV-IX-20, 41.
Good, hereditary. IV-IX-36.
Gordon, Lord George.
I-XVII-16.
III-VI-6.
Gospellers. IV-X-12.
—XII-1.
Gotescalc. IV-X-11.
—XVII-7.
Grace. IV-X-18, (end), 42, 43, 45, 49.
—XI-4.
—XII-8.
—XIII-9.

Grace. IV-XVI-5, 20, 21.
Gratian. IV-XXXI-2.
Greeks. passim. (see in Heads of Lectures.)
IV-XXV-2, 3, 4, 5, 7.
—XXVII-5.
—XXVIII-4.
—XXX-3.
—XXXII-10.
—XXXIV-7.
—XXXVI-18.
Green, Bishop. IV-XI-8.
—XXV-2. (see Methodist).
Grey, on Hudibras.
IV. Introd. 6.
—XXIII-6, 11.
—XXV-6.
—XXVIII-12.
Grotius. I-XVI-13.
—XVII-8.
IV-VI-9, 10, 13, 27.
—VII-14.
—X-15, 41.
—XI-App. 8.
—XIV-5.
—XVI-5.
—XXVII-35.
Gulliver's Travels. III-II-4.
Gurtler. IV-XVI-5.
Guy Faux. IV-IX-30, p. 172.

H

Habits (customs).
IV-X-50, p. 250.
—XVI-33-7.
—XXXVI-1.
Habits (dresses). IV-XX-1, 7.
Hales. IV-XVI-4.
—XXV-III.
—XXXVII-18.
Hallifax, Bishop.
I-XII-9.
—XVI-11.
—XVII-10.
—App. 5.
III-II-5.
IV-VI-31, 32.
—VIII-8.
—XXII-20.
Hampton-Court Conference.
II-I-9.
IV-XVI-8.
—XVII-19, 80.
—XIX-1.
—XXIII-13.
—XXV-3, 8.
—XXVII-15.
—XXXV-1.
Hardouin. I-XII-16.
Hartley. II-III-1, 3.
III-XV-11.
IV-IV-4.
—X-19, 49.
—XVIII-5.
—XXII-2.
Heads of Lectures. Vol. I. Advertisement.
II-IV-12.
IV-VII-9.
—VIII-9.
Healing, bodily and spiritual joined.
IV-XVIII-11.
—XXV-10.
Heathens. IV-VIII-11, page 107.
—XIII-1, 3, 5, 8, 17, 21, 24, 29.
—XVIII-9.
Hebrew. I-I-4.
—V-8.
—XVII-9.
IV-XXIV-3.
Hell. IV-III-3.

Hell. IV-IV-4.
—XXII-1.
Helmstadt. II-II-5.
—V-10.
Herbert, Lord of Cherbury.
I-XIX-19.
IV-X-2.
Hervey. I-IV-end.
IV-XI-15.
—XI-App. 9, 20.
Hey, William, his Short Defences. IV-I-18.
—II-16, 37.
—V-13.
—X-37, 41.
—XI-App. 22, 30.
—XIII-6.
Hey, Samuel. IV-XVI-33.
Hey, Richard. —X-22.
Heylin. IV-Introd. 4.
—VII-13.
—X-15, 16, 20.
—XVII-16, 27.
—XIX-12.
—XX-1.
—XXIV-5.
—XXV-2.
—XXVI-2.
—XXXV-1, 2.
Hierocles. I-XII-17.
Hints, &c. a pamphlet.
IV-VIII-8, 11, 12.
Hoadley, Bishop.
IV-XXVIII-13.
Hobbes. IV-XVIII-6.
Holmes. I-VI-3.
Holy Ghost. IV-V-passim.
—X-39.
—XVI-4, 17, 34, 37, end.
—XXXIII-3.
—XXXV-4.
—XXXVI-17, 18, 19.
Homer. II-II-14.
IV-X-2.
—XVII-2, 25, 79, 85.
Homilies. III-V-3, 6.
—IX-6.
IV-Introd. 4.
—IX-34.
—X-11, 39.
—XI-17, 19, 21, 23.
—XI-App. 2.
—XII-12, 20.
—XIII-5.
—XIV-1.
—XV-15.
—XVI-3, 8, 10, 27.
—XVII-92.
—XXI-13.
—XXIV-1, 2.
—XXV-2, 4, 6, 8, 9.
—XXVIII-11, 20, 24.
—XXXI-4.
—XXXII-19.
—XXXV-passim.
Honorius. IV-II-10.
Hooper. IV-Introd. 4.
—XVII-16, 62, 67, 71.
—XX-1.
—XXXIV-17.
Horace. III-IX-1.
IV-IX-3.
—XV-21.
Horsley, Bishop.
I-XI-3.
—XVII-3.
IV-I-1.
—I-App.
—XXXV-4.
Hospitality. I-X-10.
—XI-7.

Huet. I-XII-1.
IV-IV-App.
Hume. I-IV-3, 4.
—XIII-8.
—XV- and
—XVI-passim.
—XVIII-11.
—XIX-19.
II-I-3.
—IV-11.
—V-10, 11.
III-III-4.
—VI-6.
—XIV-10.
—XV-11.
IV-I-17, p. 268.
—V-5.
—VII-14.
—X-19.
—XIII-5.
—XVII-2, 20.
—XVIII-5.
Hurd, Bishop.
I-XIII-13.
—XVI-7.
—XVII-passim.
IV-Introd. 2, 3. 4.
—XXII-8, 20.
Hypothesis. II-III-4.
IV-II-46.
—XI-34.
—XXVIII-6
Hypsistarii. IV-I-13.

I

James. IV-VI-25.
—XI-27.
Jansen. III-X-5.
IV--X-17.
—XVII-28.
Iconoclastæ. IV-XXII-4.
Idol. IV-XXII-13, 18.
Idolatry, its attractions.
I-XVIII-6, 21.
IV-VII-14.
Ignatius. IV-XXIII-2.
—XXXVI-3.
Jerom. IV-VI-10, 13.
—X-5, 39.
—XIII-2.
—XV-3, 12.
—XVI-9.
—XXII-5.
—XXIV-1.
—XXV-3.
—XXXII-4.
Jews, modern.
I-XVII-9, 16.
IV-VII-13, 14.
—XVII-95.
—XXII-19.
Jewel, Bishop. I-XII-16.
IV-Introd. 4.
—XVII-18.
—XXXII-12.
—XXXV-1.
Immersion. IV-XXVII-4, 26.
Impossibility. IV-X-25.
—XV-3, 4,
18, 23.
Imprecations.
IV-XXXIII-2, 4.
Imputation. IV-XI-15.
—XI-App. 20.
Independents.
IV-XXIII-6, 13.
Indifferent. IV-XX-7.
—XXXIV-17.
Indulgences. IV-XIV-1.
Infants. IV-IX-27.
—XVII-6.
—XXV-3.
—XXVII-11, 18,
27, 31.
—XXVIII-9.
—XXX-4.

Infinity. IV-I-10, p. 246.
—I-17.
—II-21.
—V-11.
Injunctions. III-IV-9.
—VII-5.
—IX-1.
IV-Introd. 5.
Insanity. IV-X-28, 44.
Inspiration. I-XII-3.
—XVI-9.
IV-XIII-10.
—XXIII-15, 17.
Intention. IV-XXVI-3, &c.
—XXVII-6.
Interest of Money.
IV-VII-14.
Jortin. I-XVI-7.
II-V-10.
IV-IX-8.
—X-5, 39, 54.
—XVII-21.
—XXI-9.
Josephus. I-VI-1.
—XIV-11, 12.
IV-VI-9, 12.
Judgment, general.
IV-XI-28.
—XII-25.
Julian. I-XII-16.
—XVIII-15.
Juliana. IV-XXVIII-10.
Justification. IV-XI-14, 21.
—XII-8.
—XIII-7.
—XVI-8, 19.
Justinian. IV-XXIV-1.

K

Kennicott. I-VIII-2.
King, Lord. IV-I-4, p. 236.
—III-3, 6.
—IV-4.
King, Lord. IV-IV-App.
—VIII-1.
—XVI-2, 4, 27.
King, Archbishop.
IV-IX-22.
—XVII-24.
King's College Chapel.
III-XV-10.
Kneeling. IV-XXXI-5.
Knowledge, γνωσις, and Wisdom, σοφια. I-XI-3, 7.
—App. 20, 24.
Knox, John. IV-XVII-23.
—XXIII-4.

L

Labour. IV-IX-14, 44.
Lactantius. I-XIX-5.
IV-I-4.
—XXXVII-5.
Lambeth Articles.
IV-XVI-8, 10, 31.
—XVII-18, 24, 29.
Lancaster. I-XVII-6.
Language, popular.
I-X-2, &c.
IV-I-17.
—IX-Introd. 3.
—IX-34.
—X-39, 41, 42, 48.
—XII-13, 23.
—XVI-30, p. 469.
—XVII-77.
Lardner. passim.
I-XII-4, 9.
—XVI-3, 7.
—XVIII-12, 14.
III-XV-6.
IV-II-6, 22.
—VI-12, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26.
—VII-11.

Lardner. passim.
IV-XVI-2.
—XVII-2, 25.
—XXXI-5.
—XXXII-2.
—XXXIV-24, 27.
—XXXVI-2.
Latimer. IV-Introd. 4.
—XVII-16, 67, 80.
—XXIII-16.
—XXVIII-11.
—XXXV-1.
Latitudinarian. IV-XI-12.
Laud; Archbishop.
IV-XVII-20, 24.
—XIX-8.
—XX-1.
—XXVII-18.
Law, Edmund, Bishop.
I-XIX-18.
III-II-5.
—VI-6.
—XIII-8.
IV-Introd. 2, 3.
Law, William. IV-XVI-10.
Leclerc. IV-X-39.
Lectures, things incidental to them. I-XVIII-12.
III-V-2.
IV-XVI-4.
—XVII-100.
—XIX-1.
—XXII-15.
—XXV-12.
—XXXI, end.
—XXXIII, end.
—XXXV-1.
Legends. IV-VI-2.
Leland. I-XII-4.
—XV-1, 6.
—XVI-10, 11, 16.
—XVIII-27.
—XIX-13, 19.
II-III-1.
IV-VI-15.
Leporius. IV-XV-3, 7.
Leslie. IV-XXVI-6.
—XXVII-8, 29.
—XXXVII-20.
Liberty, or Freedom.
III-IV-6.
—VI-5.
—XII-1.
IV-VII-3.
—IX-Introd. 5.
—IX-5.
—X-9, 19, 22, 42, 46, 49.
—XII-1.
—XVII-1, 86, 91.
Limborch. IV-XVII-11.
—XXV-7.
—XXVII-35.
—XXXVII-18.
Liturgy. IV-X-39.
—XX-2.
—XXIV-1—5.
—XXV-7.
—XXXIV-2.
—XXXVI-7, 8.
Locke. I-XII-13, end.
—XV-15.
—XVII-19.
II-II-13.
—IV-5.
III-III-6.
—XII-5, 6.
IV-I-17, p. 268.
—VII-4, end.
—VII-12, end.
—IX-Introd. 7.
—IX-40.
—X-29.
—XI-App. 9, 25.
—XVI-31.
—XVII-81, 92.
—XXIV-3.
—XXVII-27.
—XXXI-13.

Locke. IV-XXXII-17.
Logos. I-App. 25.
III-IV-5.
IV-I-6, p. 240.
—II-I, 15.
—III-I.
—VI-10.
Longinus. III-III-2.
Lord's Supper. I-XI-7.
IV-XXIII-5.
—XXV-2.
—XXVIII-11.
De Luc. I-XVI-8- subs. 5.
Lucian. I-XII-16.
—XVI-3.
II-IV-10, 13.
IV-XXXVIII-8.
Ludlam. I-IV, end.
IV-IX-28.
—X-5, 37.
—XI-15.
—XI-App. 7, 9, 16, 20.
—XIII-2, 22, 27.
Luther, and followers
I-XII-7.
IV-I-App.
—VI-26.
—VII-3, 4, 7, 14.
—IX-12.
—X-16.
—XI-6.
—XIII-5.
—XV-3.
—XVII-12.
—XXIII-6.
—XXVII-7.
—XXVIII-10.
—XXIX-1.
—XXX-5.
—XXXI-4.
—XXXVII-2, 6.
—XXXIX-2, 4.

M

Macedonius. IV-V-2.
—VIII-5.
Macknight. I-XIII-11.
IV-XVI-4, and elsewhere.
Maclaurin, John. IV-VII-3.
Magistrate. III-XIV, according to Heads of Lectures.
IV-XX-1.
—XXXIV-15, 17.
—XXXVI-14, 16.
—XXXVII-passim.
part. Sect. 3, 15.
Maimonides. I-XVII-19.
IV-VI-3, end.
—IX-4.
—X-3.
—XVII-3.
Manicheans. I-XII-7.
—App. 3, 4.
IV-I-4, 16.
—II-4.
—IV-4.
—IX-5, 7.
—X-20.
—XXII-2.
—XXX-2.
—XXXII-2.
—XXXVII-5.
Marcellinus. —XV-3.
Marmontel. —XVII-85.
Marriage. IV-XXIII-12.
—XXV-6, 9.
—XXXII. according to Heads of Lectures.
—XXXIII-3.
Marsh. I-XVI-8.
—App. 26.
IV-I-App. end.
Mass. IV-XXIV-2.
including Missa.

Mass.

Mass. IV-XXVIII-2.
—XXXI according to Heads of Lect.
Mathematics. II-I-4.
Matthew. I-VI-1.
—XIII-9.
Maty. IV-V-4.
Maxims of the Saints. III-XV-11, p. 187, &c. (see Fenelon.)
Mede. I-XVII-15.
IV-VI-32.
Melancthon. IV-Introd. 4.
—X-16.
—XVI-15.
—XVII-9, 16, 99.
—XXVIII-10, 32.
—XXXIV-17.
Memories. IV-XXII-5.
Merit. IV-IX-Introd. 8.
—XI-16.
—XIV-4.
Messaliani. IV-XXV-2.
—XXVI-2.
Metaphor. I-XVII-6, 18.
IV-V-6.
—IX-Introd. 6.
—XI-App. 27.
—XXVIII-6, 19, 20, 26, 31.
—XXXI-2, 4.
Metropolitan. IV-XXI-10.
Methodism. I-XVIII-27.
III-VIII-4.
—XV-10, page 191.
IV-X-39.
—XI-10.
—XI-App. 9.
—XII-3, 8.
—XVI-10, 31.
Methodism. IV-XVII-21.
—XXIII-6, 8, 26.
Michaelis. I-App. 26. and often elsewhere.
III-IV-5.
IV-I-App.
—XI-App. 9. (see Marsh.)
Middleton. I-IX-8.
—XII-3, 16.
—XIII-10.
—XXII-passim, and Sect. 6.
—XXVIII-28.
—XXIX-1.
—XXX-1, 8.
Mill. I-VIII-2.
Millenarians. I-XI-2.
III-IX-7.
IV-IV-5, 12.
Milton. IV-XVII-2, 100.
—XVIII-6.
Ministers, religious.
III-I-6.
—V-6.
—IX-12.
IV-XXIII-1, 15, 16.
—XXV-4.
—XXVI-1, 2, 6.
—XXVII-8. (see Priests.)
—XXXV-2.
—XXXVI-1, 8.
Miracles. I-XIII-10.
—XV. and XVI. according to Heads of Lect.
—XVIII-25.
IV-XXIII-5, 17.
Misna, or Talmud.
I-V-3.
—VIII-9.
—II-IV-5.

Misna.

Misna, or Talmud.
IV-VI-3.
—XXVII-2.
—XXXIV-4, 24.
Moderation. IV-XXXV-1.
(see Puller)
Monk. I-App. 5—9.
IV-XXXII-1.
Monophysites. IV-II-9.
Montague, Bishop.
IV-XVI-22.
Montanus. IV-V-2.
—XVI-2.
—XXII-2.
—XXVII-14.
Montesquieu. III-VI-3.
—XV-II-2.
IV-IX-28.
—XXXIV-7.
Montfaucon. I-VI-7.
Morality. I-XII-1.
—XVII-18.
—XIX-3, 4.
II-IV-4.
III-I-4.
—IX-10.
—XI-11.
—XV-4.
IV-Introd. 3.
—VI-5, 13, end.
—VII-7, 13, 14.
—XII-23.
—XIV-4.
—XVI-15, 30.
—XVII-1, 79.
—XIX-4, 7.
—XXI-15.
—XXII-20.
—XXV-6, 10.
—XXVII-2, 11.
—XXXII-1, 14.
—XXXVI-1.
—XXXVII-18, 19.
—XXXIX-6.
Moravians. III-XV-11, page 188, &c.
—XV-12.
IV-I-6, end.
—VII-13.
—XI-App. 9.
—XV-6.
—XXIV-1.
—XXXVII-10.
Mosheim. I-XII-15.
I-App.
IV-subs. 12.
II-II-10.
—V-10.
IV-XIV-1.
—XVI-4. passim.
—XXXVI-6.
—XXXVII-6.
Musgrave. —XVII-2.
Music. III-XV-10.
IV-XX-1.
Mysteries. IV-XXV-2,10, 11.
Mysticism. III-XV-11,p.187.
IV-VI-3.
—VII-3.
—XV-5.
—XVI-9.
—XXIII-6, 15.
—XXVIII-11.

N

Names, their effects.
IV-XVIII-11.
Nares. I-XII-16.
Nature. IV-IX-Introd. 8, 9.
—IX-18, 26, 30.
Neal. (see Puritans.)
III-IV-6.
—XIV-15.
IV-XVI-8.
—XVII-18.
—XXV-3.
—XXVII-15.

Neal. (see Puritans.)
IV-XXXVI-5.
Necker. IV-XXIV-1.
Necessary Doctrine.
passim. IV-Introd. 4.
—V-4.
—VIII-4.
—IX-2.
—X-11.
—XI-8.
—XII-6, 25.
—XIII-5.
—XIV-1.
—XVI-3, 8, 10, 14.
—XVII-16, 80.
—XXII-4.
—XXV-2, 4, 7.
—XXVI-2.
—XXVIII-11.
—XXX-6.
—XXXI-4.
—XXXVII-2.
Necessity. (see Liberty.)
IV-IX-Introd. 5.
—X-19, 49.
—XVII-5.
Necessity, cases of.
IV-XXIII-9, 20, 29.
—XXV-3.
—XXVII-6, 10, 14, 15.
—XXXV-1, 2.
Nestorius. IV-I-18.
—II-8, 9.
—XXI-16.
Newton, Sir Isaac.
I-VI-1.
—XVII-15.
II-IV-5.
III-IV-7.
IV-I-App.
—XXXI-13.
Nicholls. IV-Introd. 6.
Nicholls. IV-X-4.
—XI-App. 2, 6.
—XIII-2.
—XXXVI-4, 5, 7.
Norris. IV-Introd. 1.
—XXVII-29.
Not at home. III-II-4.
—VIII-1.
Novatians. IV-I-4, p. 227.
—XVI-2, 37.
Numenius. IV-I-3.

O

Oaths. IV-XXXVII-3, 5, 6, &c.
—XXXIX passim.
Ogden. IV-VIII-11.
—IX-36.
—XI-App. 9, 27.
—XXII-20.
—XXXIX-2, 5, 6.
Offering. IV-XI-App. 14.
Old Maids, Essay on.
IV-IX-30.
Omissions, in each System.
I-XVII-1.
IV-II-1.
Onkelos. I-VI-7.
—IX-3.
Opinions, seeming inconsistent, to be retained till reconciled. IV-XVI-5.
—XVII-5, 91.
Oracles. I-XVII-12.
Ordinances, ordinary built upon extraordinary.
IV-XXIII-25.
—XXV-3, 10, end.
—XXXVI-18, 19.
Ordination. IV-XXIII-4, 6, 11, 22.
—XXV-5, 9.
—XXVI-6.

Ordination. IV-XXXIV-7.
—XXXVI,
according to Heads of Lectures; particularly Sect. 2, 5.
Origen. I-VIII-6, p. 50.
—XII-17.
—XVI-7.
—XIX-5.
—App. 1.
II-IV-10.
IV-I-4.
—IV-4, 17, and Appendix.
—V-2.
—VI-21, 23, 25, 28.
—XVI-4.
—XXII-2.
—XXIII-9.
—XXIV-1, 2.
—XXVII-14.
Ormerod. I-XII-3.
IV-III-6, 8.
—V-5.
Orobio. I-VIII-1.
Overal, Bishop. IV-XV-12.
—XVI-8, 22.
—XVII-5.

P

Painting. III-XV-10.
IV-XX-1.
—XXVII-27.
Paley. IV-XIII-1, 2.
—XXVII-14.
Paphnutius. IV-XXXII-3.
—XXXVI-4.
Paraclete. IV-V-1.
Parkhurst. I-XV-16.
—App. 24.
II-IV-15.
IV-I-2.
—III-6.
—X-2, 30.
Parkhurst. IV-XI-App. 12.
—XIII-17.
—XVII-2, 83.
—XXVIII-24.
and elsewhere.
Parturition. IV-IX-44.
Pascal. II-III-1.
—V-10.
Patronage. IV-XXIII-16.
—XXXIII-17.
—XXXVI-5, 13.
Paulus Jovius. IV-XVIII-5.
Pax. IV-XXV-3
Pearson, John, Bishop.
I-VI-3, 6.
—VIII-3.
—XVII-15.
IV-I-4, p. 238.
—I-12, 17, 18.
—II-4, 8, 28.
—III-6.
—VII-10.
—XI-App. 22.
—XIX-1.
Pearson, Edward.
IV-VIII-12.
Pedantry. I-I-5.
IV-XXIV-5.
Pelagius, and followers.
IV-VIII-9, 11, p. 110.
—IX-6, 7.
—X-5.
—XIII-3.
—XV-3, 18.
—XVI-6.
—XVII-5, 83.
—XVIII-3.
—XXXVII-5.
Perfection IV-XI-1.
—XV-5.
—XVI-9.
—XVII-91.
—XXXVII-3.

Perfection.

Perfection. VI-XXXVIII-6.
Perseverance. III-IV-1.
IV-X-15.
—XVI-5, 8, 9, 22, 29, 30, 37.
Peter Lombard.
IV-V-1.
—X-26.
—XIII-4.
—XVII-29.
—XXII-13.
—XXV-2, 4.
Pews. III-IV-2.
Pharaoh. I-X-9.
IV-IX-Introd. 16.
—X-3.
—X-50, p. 254.
—XVII-29, 95.
Pharisees. IV-IV-App. page 415.
Philo. I-VI-1.
IV-I-1, 2, 3.
Philosophers, opposed to People. II-IV-passim.
III-XV-5.
IV-VI-5.
—XIX, end.
—XX-5.
—XXXIII-14.
Philostratus. I-XII-17.
—XIII-13.
Pilate. I-XIII-11.
Pindar. IV-X-2.
Pious frauds. I-VIII-9.
—XII-15.
—XV-1.
Plaifere. IV-X-5, 15, 19.
—XVII-71, 73.
Platonists. I-XII-15.
—App. 12.
IV-I-1, 3.
—IX-3, 5.
Pleasure, in studying religion. I-I-9.
Pliny. I-XII-16, 17.
—XVI-11.
—XVIII-13, 19.
IV-II-41.
Plutarch. I-XII-16.
Polycarp. IV-XXIII-2.
—XXXVI-3.
Pope, Alexander.
IV-XVII-79.
—XVIII-6, 17.
Popes, of Rome.
III-XIV-7.
IV-XXXVII-2, 13, 18.
Porson. IV-I-App.
—XXIX-2.
Porteus, Bishop.
I-X-11.
—XI-5.
—XVII-15, 18.
III-II-5.
IV-III-8.
—IV-App.
—XIV-1.
—XXII-6, 20.
—XXV-4.
—XXX-16.
Postlethwaite.
I-XVII-8, 12, 14, 19.
Potter. (in various places).
IV-XI-App. 2.
—XXVII-2, 4.
—XXVIII-24, 30.
—XXIX-1.
Powell. I-XII-5, 8.
—XVI-9.
—XVII-16, 19.
—XVIII-4, 7, 10, 30.
—XIX-1, 16.
—App. XI-subs. 6.
II-I-2.

Powell. II-II-10.
—IV-2.
III-IV-4.
—V-2.
—VI-4.
—IX-5.
—XI-10.
IV-XI-App. 9.
—XXXVI-5, 7.
Practice, aimed at in Speculation. IV-IX-Introd. 4
—X-39.
—XVII-77.
—XXVI-6.
Preaching. (see Homilies).
I-XII-12.
III-V-5.
—IX-6.
IV-XXIII-9, 24.
—XXVII-3.
—XXXV-1, 2, 5.
Precepts and Counsels.
IV-XIV-2, 4, 5.
Predestinarians.
IV-XVII-28.
Predestination.
III-IX-1.
—XV-9.
IV-Introd. 4.
—II-42.
—IX-Introd. 11.
—X-26.
—XVII-5, et passim.
That it is no Doctrine of the Church of England.
IV-XVII-16.
See also IV-XVII-30, 62, 73, 74, 77, 89.
Presbyters, or Elders, and Presbyterians.
IV-XXIII-4,6,11,17.
Presbyters, or Elders, and Presbyterians.
IV-XXV-3, 6, 10.
—XXXVI-1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 14.
Prescience. IV-IX-Introd. 8.
—XVI-31, p.471.
—XVII-7, 14, 29, 90.
Priest. IV-XXV-4.
—XXX-1, 9, 11.
—XXXI-3, 10.
—XXXII-1, 14.
—XXXV-1.
Priestley, Doctor.
I-XII-3.
—App. 5.
II-IV-7.
—V-10.
IV-I-4, 14, 16.
—II-1, 6, 12, 43, 46.
—X-18, 24.
—XI-App. 1,2,11, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30.
—XII-24.
—XVII-21.
—XXIII-8, 22, 26.
—XXVII-18, 35.
—XXVIII-12.
Primate. IV-XXI-10.
Priscillianists. IV-I-4.
—V-2.
Promises, opposed to Decrees. IV-XVII-69, 97.
Prophesying, the Gift of.
IV-XXIV-3.
Protesting Catholics.
IV-XXXVII-2.
Proselytes. I-XVI-3.
Prudence. III-XV-8.
Puller. IV-Introd. 3.
—XXIII-12.

Puller.

Puller. IV-XXV-2.
Punishment. IV-XXXVII-18, and elsewhere.
Puritan. IV-Introd. 2.
—II-21.
—VI-10.
—XI-12.
—XVI-2, 3, 8.
—XVII-18, 19.
—XX-1, 2, 4, 7.
—XXIII-16.
—XXV-3, 8.
—XXVII-14.
—XXXI-5.
—XXXIII-6, 8.
—XXXIV-8, 17.
—XXXV-1.
—XXXVI-4, 7, 16.
—XXXVII-8, 11.
Purity. IV-XXVII-2.
Pythagoras. I-App. 12.
IV-IX-3.
—X-2.
—XXXVII-4.

Q

Quakers. III-III-10.
—XI-9.
—XIV-10.
—XV-11, p. 191.
IV-II-46.
—VII-3.
—XVII-21.
—XXIII-6.
—XXV-2, 11.
—XXVI-2, 6.
—XXVII-8, 17, 29, 34.
—XXVIII-11, 29.
—XXX-10.
—XXXVII-10, 20.
—XXXIX-4, 5.
Quietism. (see Mysticism).

R

Racovian Catechism. passim. IV-X-20.
—XI-App. 8, 24.
—XIII-6.
—XVII-14.
—XVIII-5.
—XXIII-5.
—XXV-2.
—XXXIII-5.
Randall. IV-XXV-2, 10.
Ransom. IV-XI-App. 2.
Re-baptizing, re-ordaining, &c. (see Repeating).
Redemption. IV-XI-App. 2, 17, 29, p. 324.
IV-XVII-13, 22.
—XVIII-3.
Redman. IV-XXXII-10.
Reductio ad absurdum.
II-II-13.
—V-6.
IV-X-5.
—XXVI-5.
—XXIX-1.
Reformatio Legum.
IV-Introd. 4.
—VII-3.
—IX-12, 17.
—X-11, 15.
—XI-8.
—XIII-5.
—XVI-3, 8.
—XVII-16, 18, 32, 61, 66.
—XVIII-5.
—XXI-13.
—XXIII-6.
—XXV-2, 8.
—XXVI-2.
—XXVII-17.
—XXVIII-11, 20.
—XXXI-4.

Reformatio Legum.
IV-XXXIII-5.
Reformed Churches. (see Syntagma).
IV-XXVIII-10.
—XXXI-4, 8.
—XXXII-12.
—XXXIII-5.
—XXXIV-2.
—XXXVII-7.
Reformers. III-XV-5.
IV-Introd. 2, 3, 4.
—XII-1.
—XVII-9, 16, 17.
—XX-1.
—XXI-2.
—XXII-21.
—XXV-2, 8.
—XXXVI-17.
Regeneration. IV-IX-24.
—XII-8.
—XVI-20.
—XXVII-2, 14, 17.
Reland. I-V-8.
Relics. I-XIII-10.
IV-XXII-5, 19.
Remonstrants. III-V-1.
IV-X-15.
Repeating, Baptism, &c.
IV-V-1.
—XXIII-12.
—XXV-2, 3.
—XXVI-1, 3.
—XXVII-15.
—XXXIII-3.
Repentance. I-XIX-8, 13.
IV-XVI-2,5,18, 23,27,32,33, 34.
—XVII-91.
—XXV-4.
—XXVII-3.
Repentance. IV-XXXIII-1,5. including Penance.
Reprobation. IV-X-50.
—XVII-29,30, 32, 73, 92.
Republication of the Law of Nature. IV-XI-12.
Retracting. I-I-6.
III-II-5.
IV-I-1.
Revelation, Book of.
I-XVII-15.
III-X-9.
IV-IV-5.
—VI-15, 31.
Review, Monthly.
IV-XXXV-2.
Reynolds, Sir Joshua.
IV-XV-19.
Rhemish Testament.
IV-XI-App. 6.
—XIII-5.
—XIV-1.
—XVI-3, 4, 8.
—XVII-7, 9, 29, 66.
—XIX-9.
—XXI-12.
—XXII-2, 3, 4.
—XXIV-1.
—XXV-2.
—XXVIII-32.
—XXIX-1.
—XXX-4, 13.
—XXXI-2, 3, 10, 12.
Rhetorians. IV-XVIII-2.
Ricaut. IV-XXIV-1.
—XXVII-5.
—XXX-3.
Ridley. IV-Introd. 4.
—XII-1.
—XIII-5.
—XVII-16.

Ridley. IV-XXV-2.
—XXVIII-26.
Rimius. (see Moravians).
Rite. IV-XXXIV-2, 25.
Robinson. III-XIV-14.
IV-XXVII-16.
Rogers. IV-Introd. 6.
—XXV-2.
—XXXIV-17.
—XXXVII-10.
Rome. (see, in the Heads of Lectures, Romanists—and, Age of the Reformation.) IV-XIX-2, 8.
—XX-1.
—XXII-13.
—XXIX-1.
—XXXI-12, 13.
Rosenberg, Countess of. I-VI-2.
Rutherforth. I-IX-11.
II-V-10.
IV-II-42.
—IV-App.
—VIII-5.
—X-41.

S

Sabbath. I-XI-5.
IV-VII-5, 7, 13.
—XXXIV-2, 7, 15.
Sacramental Justification. IV-XI-6.
—XXV-2.
Sacramentarian. IV-XVII-18.
—XXVIII-10.
Sacraments. IV-XXV-passim.
Definition, IV-XXV-8, 9.
IV-XXVI-1, 2, 4, 6.
—XXVIII-17
Sacramentum. IV-XXV-2. and Sacrament, p. 204.
IV-XXV-6, 11.
—XXXVII-5.
Sacred Language. IV-XXIV-5.
Sacrifice. IV-XI-App. 1, 2, 14, 27.
—XXV-5.
—XXVIII-1, 10, 13, 17, 20, 24, 30.
—XXXI-2, 3, 6, 10.
Sadducees. IV-IV-App. p. 415.
Salvation. IV-XI-App. 17.
—XVIII-12.
Salvian. I-XII-4.
Samaritan. I-IX-2.
—XIII-11.
Sandys, Sir Edwin. III-XV-12.
IV-XXIV-2.
—XXV-4.
—XXX-3.
Satan, events referred to. IV-X-50.
—XVII-64.
—XXXIII-13.
Satisfaction. IV-XXV-4.
Schism. III-IV-4.
—XI-2.
—XII-1.
Schoolmaster, how the Law of Moses was one. IV-VII-14.
Schoolmen. IV-XIII-4.
—XXII-4, 6, end. also Sect. 8.
IV-XXIV-1.
—XXV-3.
—XXVI-3.
—XXXIII-4.

Schwenkfeld. IV-VI-1, 17.
—XXV-2.
Sclavonian. IV-XXIV-1.
Secker, Archbishop.
IV-XIV-1.
—XVI-4.
—XIX-1.
—XXV-3.
—XXVII-8, 18, 26.
—XXVIII-11.
—XXXI-5.
Sectaries. (see Dissenters).
Self-deceit. IV-XVI-31, p. 471.
Seminaries. II-IV-7.
Sent. IV-XXIII-15.
Sephiroths. I-App. 15, 20, 24, 26
Sermo de Tempore.
IV-I-10, p. 250.
—II-6, 19.
Sermon on the Mount.
IV-XXXVII-3, 6, 19.
—VI-4.
—XXXVIII-3.
Servant, in forms of civility.
III-VIII-2.
Servetus. IV-I-6.
—II-14.
—XXVII-14.
Shaftesbury. II-IV-15.
Shakspeare. IV-IX-3, 30, 37.
—X-41.
—XVII-66.
—XXVII-14.
Sharp, Archbishop.
II-V-4, 6.
III-IV-4.
—XI-10.
—XVI-4.
—XVII-83.
Sharp, Granville.
IV-XXXVI-7.
Sheridan. II-IV-13.
Sherlock, Bishop.
IV-IV-13, 16.
—IV-App.
—X-32.
—XI-2.
—XXXVII-15.
Siam, King of. I-XV-15, 16.
Sick. IV-XXV-4, 7, 10.
—XXVIII-10, 21.
Simeon Stilites. IV-XIV-4.
Sins, mortal, venial, &c.
IV-XVI-2, 13, 15.
Sleidan. IV-VII-3.
—XVI-3.
—XXXVII-6.
Society, for propagating the Gospel. I-XIX-18.
Society, religious.
I-XIX-15—17.
IV-XXXVI-7.
Socinus, and followers. (see Dr. Priestley).
IV-Introd. 2.
—I-14, 16.
—II-12, 21.
—IV-2.
—V-4.
—IX-14.
—X-18.
—XI-App. 1, 8, 33.
—XVII-14, 21.
—XXIII-5, 22, 24.
—XXV-2.
—XXVII-9, 27, 35.
—XXVIII-13.
—XXXIII-5.
—XXXVI-6.
Soul. IV-III-8.
—IX-Introd. 6, 7.
Socrates. I-XII-16.
II-IV-10, 13, 14.
IV-XIII-24.
Sparrow, Bishop.
III-IV-1.

Sparrow, Bishop.
IV-XXIV-5.
—XXV-4.
—XXXIV-5, 7.
—XXXV-1.
Spirits. I-I-9.
—App. 8.
Sponsors. IV-XXV-3.
—XXVII-14.
Sprinkling. IV-XXVII-10.
Sterne. I-App. 14.
II-I-9.
—IV-13.
III-IV-1.
IV-XXX-6.
Stillingfleet. IV-VII-14.
—XXXVI-5.
Stoics. IV-XVI-5.
—XVII-2.
Strype. IV-Introd. 4.
—III-2.
—VII-7.
—IX-12.
—XVI-3.
—XVII-18.
—XXV-2.
—XXXV-4.
Suarez. IV-XIII-4.
Subintroduced women.
IV-XXXII-2.
Succession of Bishops.
IV-XXIII-4, 7, 18.
—XXXVI-7.
Supererogation. IV-XIV-2.
Superstition. I-I-9.
III-XV-11.
IV-Introd. 3.
Supralapsarians and Sublapsarians. IV-XVII-29.
Swedenborg. I-XVI-7.
III-XV-11, p. 187, &c.
IV-I-6, p. 241.
Swift. II-III-1, 4.
Swift. II-IV-13.
Switzerland. I-VIII-1.
III-VI-6.
—VII-6.
IV-III-1, 2.
—XVII-15, 18.
—XX-1.
—XXIII-12.
Synesius. IV-IV-1.
—XXXIII-3.
Synod. IV-XXI-10.
Syntagma, or Corpus et Syntagma. (see Reformed Churches.)
IV-XI-App. 2, 5.
—XVI-19.
—XVII-14.
—XIX-7.
—XXV-2.
—XXVI-2.
—XXVIII-10.
—XXXIV-20.

T

Targum. I-IX-3.
Taylor, Jeremy. III-IV-8.
—VI-6.
Taylor, John. IV-IX-13, 14, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36.
IV-X-18, 19.
—XI-14, 27, 28.
—XI-App. 9, 12, 22, 29, p. 324.
—XII-20.
—XIII-10.
—XVII-81, 92.
Temptations.
IV-IX-Introd. 12, 16.
—X-3.
Tertullian. IV-I-4, p. 227.
—VII-5.
—XI-App. 2.
—XV-2.

Tertullian. IV-XXVII-2, 14.
—XXXIV-5.
Test and Corporation Acts.
III-XIV-15.
Testament. IV-XXVIII-24.
Testament, Old.
I-V.
—VI-3.
—VIII-1.
—IX-1, 2.
—XII-Introd.
—XVI-8.
—XVII-1, &c.
—App. 4-subs. 8.
IV-IV-6—9.
—VII-2.
—XI-App. 24.
—XXIII-22.
Theodoret. IV-XXV-2.
—XXVII-14.
Thomas, Bishop.
IV-XXXII-10.
Tillotson. I-XVI-14.
IV-I-3, 16.
—II-1.
Tindal. IV-XI-12.
—XXXIV-21.
Toland. I-XII-4.
IV-VI-15.
Toleration. III-XIV-4, 15.
—XV-5.
IV-XIX-1.
—XXXIII-8.
—XXXIV-17, 19, 24.
—XXXVII-13.
Tombs. IV-XXVII-14, 35.
Tradition. IV-VI-2, &c.
—XXXIV-1, 4, and according to Heads of Lectures.
Traitor. IV-XXVI-1.
Transubstantiation.
I-XVI-14.
IV-XXVIII, according to Heads of Lectures.
—XXIX and XXX.
—XXXI-2, 10.
Travis. III-XV-6.
IV-I-Appendix.
Trent Catechism.
IV-XXV-2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9.
—XXVI-2, 3.
—XXVII-6.
—XXVIII-10, 20, 33.
—XXIX-1, 4.
—XXX-4.
—XXXI-3.
Trent, Council of.
IV-VI-2, 10.
—IX-12.
—X-20.
—XI-7.
—XI-App. 6.
—XIII-6.
—XIV-1.
—XV-4.
—XVI-3.
—XVII-9, 29. (See, in Heads of Lectures, Romanists, and Age of the Reformation.)
—XXI-2—4.
—XXII-2—6.
—XXIV-1, 2.
—XXV-2—7.
—XXVI-2, 3.
—XXVII-6.
—XXVIII-10, 20.
—XXIX-1.
—XXX-4.
—XXXI-3, 8.
—XXXII-11.

Trent,

Trent, Council of.
IV-XXXIII-5.
—XXXVI-7.
Trent Creed. IV-XIX-2.
Tribes. I-IX-1.
Trinity. I-XII-12.
—XVI-7.
III-XV-9.
IV-Introd. 1.
—I-1, &c. according to Heads of Lectures.
—IX-6.
Trisagium. IV-XXVIII-4.
Tucker. IV-X-15.
—XIX-7.
Turretin. IV-X-50.
—XVII-29.
Twining. IV-IV-Appendix.
—X-44.
Twisse. IV-XVII-29.

U & V

Ubiquity. IV-IV-3.
—XXVIII-10, 11.
Veneer. IV-Introd. 6.
—XIII-2.
—XXII-2.
—XXIV-1.
Vespasian. I-XVI-10.
Ugolino. I-X-8.
Vigilantius. IV-XXII-5, 6.
—XXXII-4.
Virgin Mary.
IV-XV-4, 24.
—XXII-4, 6, 13, 20.
Virtue. IV-XI-28, 29.
—XII-23, 25.
—XVII-87.
Virtue, what may be called original. IV-IX-36.
Visitation. IV-XXXV-1.
Unction. IV-XXV-3, 5, 7, 9, 10, including Extreme unction.
—XXVII-4.
Uniformity, Act of.
III-XIV-15.
IV-XXXIV-17.
—XXXVI-5.
Unitarians. IV-I-5, 13.
Vocation. (See Called.)
IV-XVII-14.
—XXIII-16.
Voltaire. I-App. 26.
II-V-10, 11.
III-IV-5, 9.
—XV-11, p. 187.
IV-I-4, p. 241.
—I-Appendix.
—IV-Appendix, end.
—IX-4, 40.
—X-9, 17, 19.
—XXI-9.
—XXII-3.
—XXX-4.
Vossius. IV-X-4, 5, 9.
—XII-3.
—XVI-5.
—XVII-28.
Usher. IV-VIII-5.
—X-9.
—XVII-24, 30, 37, 71, 75, 95, 98.
—XXIV-1, 2.

W

Wafer. IV-XXVIII-3, 11.
Wakefield. I-IX-11, page 62.
—XVII-6.
Waldenses. IV-XXIII-3.

Waldenses. IV-XXVIII-10.
—XXXVI-4.
—XXXVII-6.
Wall. IV-IX-8.
—XI-App. 2.
—XV-3.
—XXV-2.
—XXVII-4, 12, 13, 14, 27.
Walton. I-IX-3, 10.
IV-XVII-24.
—XXII-20.
Warburton.
I-XI-3.
—XII-3, 15.
—XVII-3, 7, 10, 14, 15, p. 246, 18.
II-III-1, 6, 14.
—IV-13, 16.
—V-10.
III-XIV-5.
IV-VII-8.
—IX-21, 34, 38.
—XI-App. 9, 19, 21.
—XII-2, 19.
—XX-7.
—XXVIII-13.
—XXXIII-8.
Washing of feet.
I-XI-6.
IV-XXV-2.
—XXVIII-29.
Waterland. IV-I-12.
—I-App.
—VIII-8, 9, 12.
—XIII-4, end.
—XVI-8.
—XVII-24.
Wesley. II-IV-16.
III-VIII-4.
—XV-11, p. 191.
IV-X-39.
—XI-App. 9.
Wesley. IV-XV-5.
—XVI-10. (See Methodism.)
—XXIII-8.
—XXVII-17.
—XXVIII-11.
Wheatly. passim.
IV-XXV-3.
—XXVIII-11.
Whiston. IV-I-6.
—II-14.
Whitby. I-XVII-19.
IV-VI-32.
—X-15.
—XVI-5.
—XVII-5, 71.
Whitehead, William.
IV-XVII-85.
Whitfield. IV-X-39.
—XVI-10.
Whitgift. IV-III-2.
—XVII-18.
—XXV-2.
—XXVII-15, 18.
Wickliffe. IV-XVII-9.
—XXI-2.
—XXV-2.
—XXVI-2.
—XXVIII-10.
—XXXI-4.
—XXXIII-5, 8, 13.
—XXXVI-5.
—XXXVII-6.
Will-worship. IV-XIV-3.
—XXII-15.
Wisdom. (See Knowledge.)
Witches. I-XIII-10.
III-VI-6.
Woolston. I-XVI-7.
IV-IV-1, 7, 13.
—VII-3.

Works.

Works. IV-XI-18, 27, 28.
—XII-6, 23.
—XIII-8.
Worship. IV-II-16.
—XXII-9.
—XXV-6.
Wotton. (See Misna.)
IV-VI-3.
—XXXIV-4, 24.

X

Ximenes. I-IX-10.

Z

Zuingle, and followers.
IV-XVI-7, 10.
—XVII-9, 10.
—XXVIII-10.

INDEX

OF PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

GENESIS xxxvii. 10.	I-XVII-6.
Exodus vii. 13.	—X-9.
Deuteronomy iv. 2.	IV-VI-4.
——————— xii. 32.	Ibidem.
1 Sam. xiii. 14.	I-X-10.
Proverbs xvi. 4.	IV-XVII-95.
Isaiah vii. 14—16.	I-XVII-14.
—— ix. 6.	—XVII-10.
—— xi. 6.	Ibidem.
—— liii. —	I-XVII-15.
Ezekiel xviii.	IV-IX-38.
Daniel v. 28.	I-XVII-19.
Joel i. 7, &c.	} I-XVII-10.
—— ii. 1—10.	
Matthew ii. 15.	I-XVII-19.
——— — 23.	Ibidem.
——— iii. 2.	IV-XXVII-3.
——— v. and vi.	—VI-4.
——— v. 29, 30.	—XXXVIII-9.
——— v. 33—37.	—XXXIX-4.
——— v. 38—41.	—XXXVII-19.
——— xviii. 7.	—IX-Introd. 12.
——— —— 15—18.	—XXXIII-7, 9, 11.
——— xix. 11, 12.	—XXXII-18.
——— — 16, &c.	—XXXVIII-6.
——— — 17.	—XV-16.
——— — 21.	—XIV-5.
——— xxi. 16.	I-XVII-19.
——— xxiii. 16—22.	IV-XXXIX-4.
——— xxiv.	I-XVII-10.

Matthew xxiv. 24.	IV-XVI-30.
—— xxv. 34.	—XVII-80.
Mark x. 14.	—XXVII-27.
—— xii. 29. 32.	—I-17.
—— xiii. 24—26.	I-XVII-10.
—— xvi. 16.	IV-VIII-11, 12, 32.
—— — 17.	I-XVI-13.
Luke i. 6.	IV-XV-17.
—— iv. 18.	I-XVI-11.
—— ix. 55.	Ibidem.
—— xi. 15, 16.	Ibidem.
—— xvi. 8.	I-X-10.
—— — 19, &c.	IV-XXXVIII-7.
—— xvii. 1.	—IX-Introd. 12.
—— xviii. 22.	—XIV-5.
John i. 1, &c.	IV-II-37.
—— i. 19—25.	—XXVII-11.
—— vii. 11.	—XVII-83.
—— viii. 58.	—II-35.
—— xvii. —	—I-17.
—— xvii. —	—XVI-30.
Acts ii. 23.	—XVII-79.
—— — 44, 45.	—XXXVIII-8.
—— iv. 32. 34.	Ibidem.
—— viii. 4.	IV-XXIII-24.
—— x. 32.	I-X-11.
—— xi. 19.	IV-XXIII-24.
—— xiii. 2.	—XXIII-22.
—— —— 48.	—XVII-83.
—— xv.	—XXI-1.
—— xx. 28.	—I-18.
Romans ii. 14. 27.	—XIII-24.
—— v.	—IX-29.
—— viii. 1, 2.	—XV-20.
—— — 5—7.	—IX-18, 25.
—— — 28—30.	—XVII-49, 77.
—— — 33, &c.	—XV-20.
—— ix. 13, &c.	—XVII-95.
—— xi. 29.	—XVI-30.
—— xvi. 17.	—XXXIII-12.
1 Cor. i. 8.	—XVI-30.
—— — 30.	—XV-20.
—— v. —	—XXXIII-13.

1. Cor. vii.	I-XII-3. IV-XXVII-27. —XXXII-17. —XXXIII-15.
——— viii. 6.	IV-I-17.
——— ix. 5.	—XXXII-17.
——— xi. 2.	—VI-5.
——— xv. 10.	—X-41.
——— — 24.	—IV-20.
2 Cor. i. 22.	—XVI-30.
——— ii. 10.	—XXXIII-14, 15.
——— xiii. 14.	—I-17.
Gal. iv. 5.	—XVI-30.
Eph. i. 13.	Ibidem.
—— iv. 30.	Ibidem.
—— v. 27.	IV-XV-20.
Phil. i. 1—10.	—XIII-30.
—— —6.	—XVI-30.
—— ii. 5—11.	—II-31.
—— — 12, 13.	—X-41.
Col. i. 16—20.	—II-31, 35.
—— ii. 20—23.	—XVI-3.
1 Thess. v. 9.	—XVII-83.
2 Thess. ii. 15.	—VI-5.
——— iii. 3.	—XVI-30.
1 Tim. vi. 20.	I-App. 24.
——— iii. 16.	IV-II-37.
2 Tim. i. 9.	—XVII-83.
——— ii. 19.	—XVI-30.
——— iii. 14, 15, &c.	—VI-4.
Hebrews i.	—II-31.
——— vi. 1—9.	—XVI-33.
——— — 11.	—XVI-31.
——— x. 22.	Ibidem.
——— — 26.	IV-XVI-33.
James ii. 10.	Ibidem.
—— v. 12.	IV-XXXIX-5.
—— — 14, 15.	—XXV-10.
1 Peter i. 5.	—XVI-30.
——— — 10—12.	I-XVII-13.
——— ii. 8.	IV-XVII-95.
——— iv. 8.	—XIV-6.
2 Peter i. 20.	I-XVII-15.

1 John iii. 9.	{ IV-XV-19. / —XVI-33.
——— v. 16.	IV-XVI-33.
2 John 10, 11.	—XXXIII-14.
Jude 4.	—XVII-95.
Revelation xxii. 18, 19.	—VI-4.

END OF THE FOURTH VOLUME.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

ERRATA.

Page
3. l. 32. for " this writer of" r. *the writer on.*
8. l. 13. for Simplicus, r. *Simplicius.*
13. l. 4. for conſent, r. *counſel.*
14. l. 3 from bottom, dele *is.*
18. l. 23. r. Rom. viii. 13.
20. l. 25. for LIV, r. LXIV.
21. l. 12. r. quandam.
26. l. 29. r. foreſee.
27. l. 7. for taken, r. *crucified.*
35. l. 20. before *will* inſert *We.*
37. l. 18. for *a ſuch*, r. *ſuch a.*
39. l. 20. for *knowledge*, r. *foreknowledge.*
51. l. 11. for *it*, r. *that it had not.*
59. l. 14. for object, r. *objects.*
96. running title, for xx, r. xxi.
113. l. 13. r. to have.
136. l. 27. dele *the.*
138. l. 13. for degree, r. *degrees.*
146. l. 4. for indirect, r. *direct.*
181. l. 5 from bottom, r. Sclavonians.
199. l. 5. for divided, r. *deviſed.*
213. l. 10. r. Ακολαθια.

Page
227. loweſt line, for xi, r. ii.
243. l. 21. r. ασθενεῖ.
280. l. 28. r. yield.
286. l. 17. r. *the* Romiſh Church.
305. running title, r. Sect. xxvii.
317. l. 14. for ſort, r. *ſorts.*
322. l. 20 & 21. r. ſuppoſition.
327. l. 15. r. Liege.
345. l. 15. r. *the* Bread.
358. l. 26. r. and we *alſo* uſe.
——— l. 33. r. Corollary.
363. l. 30. r. effects.
373. l. 23. dele *and.*
422. l. 9. r. information on.
432. l. 13. for *him* and *his*, r. *them* and *their.*
433. l. 32. for *It*, r. Their excluſion.
446. l. 32. for privately, r. *purpoſely.*
458. l. 4. for Papiſt, r. *Papiſts.*
465. l. 6 from bottom, for *thoſe* times, r. *theſe* times.
497. l. 27. dele *a.*
523. l. 19. r. Zacchæus.
532. l. 3. for *a*, r. *the.*

Some names and words are ſpelt differently in different places, according to the authors from which they were taken, or the cuſtoms of different writers.